

**MINUTES OF THE CITY-COUNTY COUNCIL  
AND  
SPECIAL SERVICE DISTRICT COUNCILS  
OF  
INDIANAPOLIS, MARION COUNTY, INDIANA**

**REGULAR MEETINGS  
MONDAY, APRIL 14, 2014**

The City-County Council of Indianapolis, Marion County, Indiana and the Indianapolis Police Special Service District Council, Indianapolis Fire Special Service District Council and Indianapolis Solid Waste Collection Special Service District Council convened in regular concurrent sessions in the Council Chamber of the City-County Building at 7:05 p.m. on Monday, April 14, 2014, with Councillor Lewis presiding.

Councillor Barth introduced Pastor Rodric Reid, who led the opening prayer. He then invited all present to join him in the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

**ROLL CALL**

The President instructed the Clerk to take the roll call and requested members to register their presence on the voting machine. The roll call was as follows:

*29 PRESENT: Adamson, Barth, Brown, Cain, Evans, Freeman, Gooden, Gray, Hickman, Holliday, Hunter, Lewis, Lutz, Mahern, Mansfield, Mascari, McHenry, McQuillen, Miller, Moriarty Adams, Oliver, Osili, Pfisterer, Robinson, Sandlin, Scales, Shreve, Simpson, Talley*  
*0 ABSENT:*

A quorum of twenty-nine members being present, the President called the meeting to order.

**INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS AND VISITORS**

Councillor Pfisterer recognized Scott Harris, Speedway Development Commission. Councillor Mascari introduced the Council's new Chief Financial Officer Bart Brown. Councillor McHenry recognized west-side friend and activist Dale Bough. Councillor McQuillen recognized former City-County Councillor Bill Dowden. Councillor Scales recognized the Sandy Point Condominium Association. Councillor Osili recognized David Lewis from AT&T. Councillor Oliver recognized the Arsenal Tech Titans. Councillor Evans recognized Reverend Mmoja Ajabu. Councillor Miller recognized the neighbors of Garfield Park in attendance.

## OFFICIAL COMMUNICATIONS

The President called for the reading of Official Communications. The Clerk read the following:

TO ALL MEMBERS OF THE CITY-COUNTY COUNCIL AND POLICE, FIRE AND SOLID WASTE COLLECTION SPECIAL SERVICE DISTRICT COUNCILS OF THE CITY OF INDIANAPOLIS AND MARION COUNTY, INDIANA

Ladies And Gentlemen :

You are hereby notified the REGULAR MEETINGS of the City-County Council and Police, Fire and Solid Waste Collection Special Service District Councils will be held in the City-County Building, in the Council Chambers, on Monday, April 14, 2014, at 7:00 p.m., the purpose of such MEETINGS being to conduct any and all business that may properly come before regular meetings of the Councils.

Respectfully,  
s/Maggie A. Lewis  
President, City-County Council

March 24, 2014

TO PRESIDENT LEWIS AND MEMBERS OF THE CITY-COUNTY COUNCIL AND POLICE, FIRE AND SOLID WASTE COLLECTION SPECIAL SERVICE DISTRICT COUNCILS OF THE CITY OF INDIANAPOLIS AND MARION COUNTY, INDIANA:

Ladies and Gentlemen:

Pursuant to the laws of the State of Indiana, I caused to be published in the *Court & Commercial Record* and in the *Indianapolis Star* on Friday, March 28, 2014 a copy of a Notice of Public Hearing on Proposal Nos. 80 and 90, 2014, said hearing to be held on Monday, April 14, 2014, at 7:00 p.m. in the City-County Building.

Respectfully,  
s/NaTrina DeBow  
Clerk of the City-County Council

March 28, 2014

TO PRESIDENT LEWIS AND MEMBERS OF THE CITY-COUNTY COUNCIL AND POLICE, FIRE AND SOLID WASTE COLLECTION SPECIAL SERVICE DISTRICT COUNCILS OF THE CITY OF INDIANAPOLIS AND MARION COUNTY, INDIANA:

Ladies and Gentlemen:

I have approved with my signature and delivered this day to the Clerk of the City-County Council, NaTrina DeBow, the following ordinances:

FISCAL ORDINANCE NO. 6, 2014 – approves an additional appropriation of \$28,500 in the 2014 Budget of the Marion County Election Board (HAVA Fund) to purchase equipment to help voters with disabilities, funded by a grant from the Indiana Secretary of State

FISCAL ORDINANCE NO. 7, 2014 – approves an additional appropriation of \$20,000 in the 2014 Budget of the Information Services Agency (Enhanced Access Fund) for the creation and development of the Attorney ID card application through LoGO Indiana for the Marion Superior Court

FISCAL ORDINANCE NO. 8, 2014 – approves a transfer of \$550,000 in the 2014 Budget of the Information Services Agency (Information Services Fund) for expenses related to the ISA capital improvement plan

FISCAL ORDINANCE NO. 9, 2014 – approves an additional appropriation of \$85,000 in the 2014 Budget of the Department of Metropolitan Development (Redevelopment Fund) for a full-time attorney from the Office of Corporation Counsel dedicated solely to Brownfield litigation, and approves a corresponding transfer of \$85,000 in the 2014 Budget of the Office of Corporation Counsel (Consolidated County Fund) to compensate for the interdepartmental chargebacks and the resources given up for the Brownfield program

FISCAL ORDINANCE NO. 10, 2014 – approves an additional appropriation of \$403,516 in the 2014 Budget of the Department of Metropolitan Development (Federal Grants and Consolidated County Funds) in order to utilize prior year federal transportation planning grant awards

FISCAL ORDINANCE NO. 11, 2014 – approves a transfer of \$29,990 and an additional appropriation of \$350,000 in the 2014 Budget of the Marion County Community Corrections (State Grants Fund) to cover work release beds

*April 14, 2014*

FISCAL ORDINANCE NO. 12, 2014 – approves a transfer of \$318,576 and an additional appropriation of \$50,000 in the 2014 Budget of the Marion County Community Corrections (County Misdemeanant, County General and User Fee Funds) to fund security for the DuValle Residential Center

SPECIAL ORDINANCE NO. 1, 2014 – authorizes the final bond issuance for Flaherty and Collins Properties, Inc. (MSA North) in an amount not to exceed \$23,000,000 for the construction, acquisition, renovation and equipping of a new 28-story mixed-use development facility, consisting of approximately 300 luxury apartments, 43,000 square feet of retail space and a 550-space parking facility located on a downtown square block bounded on the south by East Market Street, on the west by North Alabama Street, on the north by East Wabash Street, and on the east by North New Jersey Street (District 15)

GENERAL RESOLUTION NO. 4, 2014 – approves the statement of benefits for TCC Real Estate Holdings, LLC as an applicant for tax abatement for property located in an economic revitalization area

SPECIAL RESOLUTION NO. 13, 2014 – recognizes the winners and participants of the 2013 Indy VEX Robotics Championships

SPECIAL RESOLUTION NO. 14, 2014 – recognizes Delorean Major, Luke Granholm, Chad Lynn & Dawn Hickman Faulkner for their bravery to assist another human being in the face of personal danger

SPECIAL RESOLUTION NO. 15, 2014 – agrees to support and provide resources necessary for the City of Indianapolis to host the Super Bowl in 2018

SPECIAL RESOLUTION NO. 16, 2014 – agrees to support and provide resources necessary for the City of Indianapolis to host the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) Final Four Men's Basketball Championship

SPECIAL RESOLUTION NO. 17, 2014 – determines the need to lease office space for the Marion County Probation Office to provide an eastside office for the probationers which it is charged with monitoring and supervising

SPECIAL RESOLUTION NO. 18, 2014 – approves the amounts, locations and programmatic operation of projects to be funded from Community Development Grant Funds

Respectfully,  
s/Gregory A. Ballard, Mayor

### **ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA**

The President proposed the adoption of the agenda as distributed. Without objection, the agenda was adopted.

### **APPROVAL OF THE JOURNAL**

The President called for additions or corrections to the Journals of March 17, 2014. There being no additions or corrections, the minutes were approved as distributed.

### **PRESENTATION OF PETITIONS, MEMORIALS, SPECIAL RESOLUTIONS, AND COUNCIL RESOLUTIONS**

PROPOSAL NO. 138, 2014. The proposal, sponsored by Councillor Miller, recognizes the life and accomplishments of Margie Nackenhorst, otherwise known as the Mayor of Garfield Park. Councillor Miller read the proposal and presented family members with copies of the document and Council pins. Debbie Nackenhorst, Ms. Nackenhorst's daughter, thanked the Council for the recognition. Councillor Miller moved, seconded by Councillor McQuillen, for adoption. Proposal No. 138, 2014 was adopted by a unanimous voice vote.

Proposal No. 138, 2014 was retitled SPECIAL RESOLUTION NO. 19, 2014, and reads as follows:

CITY-COUNTY SPECIAL RESOLUTION NO. 19, 2014

A SPECIAL RESOLUTION recognizing the life and accomplishments of Margie Nackenhorst, otherwise known as the Mayor of Garfield Park.

WHEREAS, on December 12, 1919, Margie Nackenhorst was born in Frankfort, Indiana to the late Lee and Gertrude McKinsey; and

WHEREAS, since the 1950s, Ms. Nackenhorst was a cheerleader for community development that pushed Indianapolis to conserve and reinvest in the City's oldest park; an honorary director for the Friends of Garfield Park, which is a nonprofit group dedicated to preserving the facility and supporting its programs; and a great community leader who was passionate about making her community a better place; and

WHEREAS, Ms. Nackenhorst was responsible for a number of additions and improvements to Garfield Park, which include: two additional tennis courts; repavement of six existing courts; installation of additional lighting for all eight of the tennis courts; and repair of the swimming pool; and

WHEREAS, Ms. Nackenhorst advocated to get the Indianapolis Fire Department (IFD) Station 29 built in Garfield Park, and worked with the vice division of the City's police department to clear the park of teenage cruisers who loitered, violated park rules, and caused traffic jams after dark; and

WHEREAS, Ms. Nackenhorst led the Park's clean-up efforts of pulling weeds and picking up trash, alongside the volunteers she recruited; as well as saved the Park's 1903 pagoda from being demolished; kept the conservatory from being moved out of the park; initiated naming the two main streets in Garfield Park: Conservatory Drive and Pagoda Drive; and helped rename the Indianapolis Public Library's Shelby Street Branch the "Garfield Park Branch" in 2011; and

WHEREAS, when the Park's fountains went out, Ms. Nackenhorst led the donation effort to have them repaired. She also advocated for the Confederate Soldiers and Sailors Memorial Statue to remain in the park, where it had been since 1919, and was involved in the celebration of the Southside park's 100th anniversary in 2003; and

WHEREAS, Ms. Nackenhorst picketed every Saturday afternoon for more than two years to get rid of an adult bookstore near her home; lobbied against the Sunday sale of liquor and against parimutuel betting in the 1970s; while also volunteering with her daughter at the Marion County Children's Guardian Home in Irvington; and

WHEREAS, Ms. Nackenhorst was on the slating committee that voted in Richard Lugar to run on the Republican ticket for Mayor of Indianapolis in 1967. In his inaugural speech in 1968 at Clowes Hall, Former Mayor Lugar nicknamed Ms. Nackenhorst the "Unofficial Mayor of Garfield Park"; and

WHEREAS, Ms. Nackenhorst passed away on March 2, 2014; but will be forever remembered for her dedication to improving the Garfield Park area; now, therefore:

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY-COUNTY COUNCIL OF THE  
CITY OF INDIANAPOLIS AND OF MARION COUNTY, INDIANA:

SECTION 1. The Indianapolis City-County Council recognizes Margie Nackenhorst for a lifetime of advocacy for the things in which she believed and her contributions to her community.

SECTION 2. The Council extends its deepest sympathy to the family of Ms. Nackenhorst in the loss of such a special woman.

SECTION 3. The Mayor is invited to join in this resolution by affixing his signature hereto.

SECTION 4. This resolution shall be in full force and effect upon adoption and compliance with IC 36-3-4-14.

President Lewis asked for consent to move Proposal No. 143, 2014 next on the agenda, as it recognizes public safety officials who need to leave. Consent was given.

PROPOSAL NO. 143, 2014. The proposal, sponsored by Councillor McQuillen, recognizes the Indianapolis Metropolitan Police Department's Special Weapons and Tactics (SWAT) team. Councillor McQuillen read the proposal and presented representatives with copies of the

*April 14, 2014*

document and Council pins. Chief Rick Hite, Assistant Chief Gary Coons and director Tom Sellas thanked the Council for the recognition. Councillor McQuillen moved, seconded by Councillor Hunter, for adoption. Proposal No. 143, 2014 was adopted by a unanimous voice vote.

Proposal No. 143, 2014 was retitled SPECIAL RESOLUTION NO. 20, 2014, and reads as follows:

CITY-COUNTY SPECIAL RESOLUTION NO. 20, 2014

A SPECIAL RESOLUTION recognizing the Indianapolis Metropolitan Police Department (IMPD) Special Weapons and Tactics (SWAT) team.

WHEREAS, Indianapolis Metropolitan Police Department (IMPD) officers, and others serving in law enforcement, put their lives on the line every single day to keep Indianapolis a safe place to live; and

WHEREAS, responding to a tip from neighbors, a little after 7:00 p.m. on Wednesday, March 6, 2014, Special Weapons and Tactics (SWAT) officers prepared to enter a home southeast of the Fountain Square neighborhood to serve a narcotics-related warrant; and

WHEREAS, highly trained SWAT officers approached the back entrance of the residence on high alert, wearing bulletproof vests with guns drawn; and

WHEREAS, before officers had an opportunity to enter, they came under fire by one of the suspects in the house. The officers returned fire, and due to their training and the use of good equipment, four other occupants of the home were unharmed and four SWAT officers sustained only non-life-threatening injuries and were able to return quickly to active duty; and

WHEREAS, the IMPD SWAT team, led by Commander Tom Sellas, puts themselves in danger every day in circumstances such as these in order to “protect and serve” citizens; now, therefore:

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY-COUNTY COUNCIL OF THE  
CITY OF INDIANAPOLIS AND OF MARION COUNTY, INDIANA:

SECTION 1. The Indianapolis City-County Council recognizes the Indianapolis Metropolitan Police Department (IMPD) Special Weapons and Tactics (SWAT) team.

SECTION 2. The Council extends its appreciation and gratitude to these officers and all law enforcement personnel for their willingness to lay their lives on the line every single day in order to keep this community safe.

SECTION 3. The Council further wishes each law enforcement officer personal safety during the course of their duties and corporate success in fighting crime throughout the City and County.

SECTION 3. The Mayor is invited to join in this resolution by affixing his signature hereto.

SECTION 4. This resolution shall be in full force and effect upon adoption and compliance with IC 36-3-4-14.

President Lewis stated that she was able to spend some time with the injured officers on that evening, and she hopes all Councillors remember this event when it comes time to discuss funding for public safety personnel during the budget process.

PROPOSAL NO. 139, 2014. The proposal, sponsored by Councillors Adamson and Talley, recognizes the staff and volunteers of Indianapolis Animal Care and Control for their many hours of service in 2013. Councillor Adamson moved, seconded by Councillor Talley, to postpone Proposal No. 139, 2014 until May 12, 2014. Proposal No. 139, 2014 was postponed by a unanimous voice vote.

PROPOSAL NO. 140, 2014. The proposal, sponsored by Councillor Osili, recognizes David Gadis for his 2014 induction into the Indiana Basketball Hall of Fame. Councillor Osili moved, seconded by Councillor McQuillen, to postpone Proposal No. 140, 2014 until May 12, 2014. Proposal No. 140, 2014 was postponed by a unanimous voice vote.

PROPOSAL NO. 141, 2014. The proposal, sponsored by Councillors Lewis and Hickman, recognizes the Indianapolis International Airport for being recognized as the best airport in North America for 2013. Councillor Hickman read the proposal and presented representatives with copies of the document and Council pins. David Lewis, board of directors, and Bob Duncan, thanked the Council for the recognition. Councillor Hickman moved, seconded by Councillor Cain, for adoption. Proposal No. 141, 2014 was adopted on the following roll call vote; viz:

*23 YEAS: Barth, Cain, Evans, Freeman, Gooden, Gray, Hickman, Hunter, Lewis, Mansfield, McHenry, McQuillen, Miller, Moriarty Adams, Oliver, Osili, Pfisterer, Robinson, Sandlin, Scales, Shreve, Simpson, Talley*  
*5 NAYS: Adamson, Holliday, Lutz, Mahern, Mascari*  
*1 NOT VOTING: Brown*

Councillor Hickman stated that it is in bad taste to vote against this type of honoring resolution, and she finds this unacceptable.

Councillor Lutz stated that he voted against the proposal because the Airport does some things very well, but unfortunately, one of the things they do well is to suppress the values of properties in Wayne Township.

Councillor Mahern said that he supports Councillor Lutz and his criticism of the Airport board, and it is interesting to note that their board was here to receive this body's praise, but not their words of criticism. He said that Councillor Lutz has toiled for years to get the airport to understand the impact their actions have on property values. He added that they continue to thwart the efforts of a private business development that has done their due diligence and deserves to earn a living. He said that the Airport insists that all taxpayer dollars spent on the airport are to the benefit of the community, but their actions hurt the neighbors and they make it hard for businesses to operate.

Councillor Holliday said that his vote was not against the employees of the airport and their hard work, but against the policies of the current board, executed by the administration.

Councillor Hickman said that this is an honorary resolution honoring employees, and this was very unprofessional to take out personal frustrations during this proposal.

Councillor Adamson said that he understands that they were given this honor and feels it is a great honor, but he has concerns about some of the practices by the Airport's administration, particularly in relation to an ongoing issue with a small business owner. He said that this business owner has a sustainable company and has done all their due diligence to be a positive influence on that community, and he feels what the Airport is doing to them is not right. For that reason, he could not support the proposal at this time.

Proposal No. 141, 2014 was retitled SPECIAL RESOLUTION NO. 21, 2014, and reads as follows:

*April 14, 2014*

CITY-COUNTY SPECIAL RESOLUTION NO. 21, 2014

A SPECIAL RESOLUTION recognizing the Indianapolis International Airport as being named the best airport in North America for 2013.

WHEREAS, the Indianapolis International Airport (IND) was recently recognized as the best airport in North America, as part of the Airports Council International's prestigious annual Airport Service Quality Awards for Performance Excellence; and

WHEREAS, the Indianapolis International Airport employs about 10,000 people each day, serves more than 7 billion business and leisure travelers each year, and averages 138 daily flights to 34 nonstop destinations; and

WHEREAS, for the second consecutive year and the third time in the last four years, the IND has received the top honor of best airport and has been ranked in the top three airports in North America since 2010; and

WHEREAS, the Indianapolis International Airport is the first airport in the United States to win LEED® certification for an entire airport terminal campus. The airport has additionally won recognition for its excellent customer service and concession programs, as well as its art and architecture; and

WHEREAS, the Indianapolis International Airport has demonstrated a consistent record of outstanding achievements, which not only benefits the millions of travelers who pass through the airport each year, but also the City of Indianapolis and the entire State of Indiana; now, therefore:

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY-COUNTY COUNCIL OF THE  
CITY OF INDIANAPOLIS AND OF MARION COUNTY, INDIANA:

SECTION 1. The Indianapolis City-County Council proudly recognizes the Indianapolis International Airport as being named the best airport in North America for 2013.

SECTION 2. The Council heartily congratulates the Indianapolis Airport Authority on its outstanding achievement, and thanks the board and all the hardworking employees who helped make this honor possible.

SECTION 3. The Mayor is invited to join in this resolution by affixing his signature hereto.

SECTION 4. This resolution shall be in full force and effect upon adoption and compliance with Indiana Code § 36-3-4-14.

PROPOSAL NO. 142, 2014. The proposal, sponsored by Councillors Sandlin, Freeman and Hunter, recognizes the 2014 National Rifle Association's Annual Convention held in the City of Indianapolis. Councillor Cain read the proposal and presented representatives with copies of the document and Council pins. Bill Dowden, president of the State Association of Gun Owners, thanked the Council for the recognition. Councillor Cain moved, seconded by Councillor Sandlin, for adoption. Proposal No. 142, 2014 was adopted by a unanimous voice vote.

Proposal No. 142, 2014 was retitled SPECIAL RESOLUTION NO. 22, 2014, and reads as follows:

CITY-COUNTY SPECIAL RESOLUTION NO. 22, 2014

A SPECIAL RESOLUTION recognizing the 2014 National Rifle Association's Annual Convention held in the City of Indianapolis.

WHEREAS, the City of Indianapolis is hosting the National Rifle Association's Annual Meeting & Exhibits, and we proudly welcome this distinguished group and its more than 4 million members to Indianapolis, April 25-27, 2014; and

WHEREAS, the National Rifle Association was formed in 1871 with the primary goal of promoting and encouraging rifle shooting on a scientific basis after first recognizing the lack of marksmanship skills by military veterans; and

WHEREAS, the NRA has a proud history of promotion of marksmanship and firearms safety throughout its 143-year history. The Association has had a strong tradition of promoting shooting sports among America's youth, starting back in 1903 with the establishment of youth rifle clubs at a number of institutions and military academies; and

WHEREAS, today's youth programs are still a cornerstone of the NRA, with over one million youth participating in affiliated programs with groups such as the 4-H Club, Boy Scouts of American, The American Legion, U.S. Jaycees and others. Young men and women learn many skills with an emphasis on firearms safety. In addition the NRA supports the Youth Hunter Education Challenge, a program that allows youngsters to build on skills they learned in basic hunter education programs; and

WHEREAS, in early 1956 the NRA established a law enforcement instructor training program and became the first and only national trainer of law enforcement officers. This undertaking was called the NRA Police Firearms Instructors Certification Program; and

WHEREAS, the Association also supports a cadre of civilian training personnel, which boast in excess of 50,000 certified instructors who train approximately 750,000 gun owners. Through these various programs and with the support of its members, the Association always promotes the safe and responsible ownership and use of firearms throughout our nation and beyond; now, therefore:

**BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY-COUNTY COUNCIL OF THE  
CITY OF INDIANAPOLIS AND MARION COUNTY, INDIANA:**

SECTION 1: The Indianapolis City-County Council proudly welcomes the National Rifle Association Conference for its 2014 National Convention, bringing more than 70,000 visitors from across the United States and generating an estimated \$55 million in economic impact, \$4.5 million in state taxes, and \$2.4 million in local taxes, while supporting more than 714 local jobs.

SECTION 2: The Indianapolis City-County Council thanks the NRA for its many contributions to the citizens of our nation, our state and our city.

SECTION 3: The Mayor is invited to join in this Resolution by affixing his signature hereto.

SECTION 4: This resolution shall be in full force upon adoption and compliance with IC 36-3-4-14.

PROPOSAL NO. 144, 2014. The proposal, sponsored by Councillors Robinson, Oliver, Gray, Brown, Talley, Adamson and Simpson, recognizes the Arsenal Technical High School Tech Titans boys basketball team who finished the season at 27-2 and won the 4A Indiana Boy's Basketball State Championship. Councillor Robinson read the proposal and presented representatives with copies of the document and Council pins. The Principal, Athletic Director Victor Bush, Coach, Mr. Basketball Trey Lyles, and Point Guard Joshua Bennett thanked the Council for the recognition. Councillor Adamson said that they have gone to the final games four times, but this is the first time they have won. Councillor Robinson moved, seconded by Councillor Adamson, for adoption. Proposal No. 144, 2014 was adopted by a unanimous voice vote

Proposal No. 144, 2014 was retitled SPECIAL RESOLUTION NO. 23, 2014, and reads as follows:

**CITY-COUNTY SPECIAL RESOLUTION NO. 23, 2014**

A SPECIAL RESOLUTION recognizing the Arsenal Tech High School – Tech Titans boys basketball team who finished the season at 27-2 and won the 4A Indiana Boy's Basketball State Championship.

WHEREAS, highlights of the season include: Finishing 3<sup>rd</sup> in the nation (MaxPreps), 2014 Indianapolis City Champions, 27 win season, which is the most in school history, defeated two nationally ranked teams, played on national television – ESPN, and had a 3.2 Team GPA; and

WHEREAS, Jeremie Tyler was 1st Team All-City and finished as the school's all-time 3 point shooter in field goals made, finished 6th all-time scorer in Tech history, and named 1st team all-state. Mikey Jones was 3rd Team All-



April 14, 2014

City, named to Top 60 Workout, and scored a 29 on his ACT. CJ Walker was 3rd Team All-City and invited to Top 100 Underclassman Workout. And Justin Parker was named a Top 100 Senior; and

WHEREAS, Trey Lyles, who won his 3rd straight Indianapolis City Player of the Year, was a McDonald's All-American, a Trester Award winner, a Parade All-American, and Indianapolis Super Team Player of the Year. He became the school's all-time leading scorer and rebounder and he set the single game scoring record (45-points) and was named 1st team all-state; and

WHEREAS, Josh Whitfield, Eric Meeks, John Roberts, Devin Mickens, CJ Walker, Jason Beck, Deonta Murray, Rashaun Richardson, Demetrius Shaw, Jeremie Tyler, Michael Jones, Donte Gladney, Justin Parker, and Trey Lyles were members of the team and all contributed to the state championship. Along with Head Coach Jason Delaney, Superintendent Dr. Lewis Ferebee, Principal Lawrence Yarrell, and the Athletic Director Victor Bush Jr.; now, therefore:

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY-COUNTY COUNCIL OF THE  
CITY OF INDIANAPOLIS AND OF MARION COUNTY, INDIANA:

SECTION 1. The Indianapolis City-County Council proudly recognizes the Arsenal Tech High School – Tech Titans boys basketball team who finished the season at 27-2 and won the 4A Indiana Boy's Basketball State Championship.

SECTION 2. The Council heartily congratulates the 2013-14 Tech Titans boys basketball team, the coach's, the teachers, the parents, and the alumni for the Indiana Boy's State Championship.

SECTION 3. The Mayor is invited to join in this resolution by affixing his signature hereto.

SECTION 4. This resolution shall be in full force and effect upon adoption and compliance with IC 36-3-4-14.

PROPOSAL NO. 145, 2014. The proposal, sponsored by Councillors Lewis and Osili, recognizes Prisoners Reformed United, Inc. Councillor Osili read the proposal and presented representatives with copies of the document and Council pins. Reverend Perry Vaughn, founder, thanked the Council for the recognition. Councillor Osili moved, seconded by Councillor Hickman, for adoption. Proposal No. 145, 2014 was adopted by a unanimous voice vote.

Proposal No. 145, 2014 was retitled SPECIAL RESOLUTION NO. 24, 2014, and reads as follows:

CITY-COUNTY SPECIAL RESOLUTION NO. 24, 2014

A SPECIAL RESOLUTION recognizing Prisoners Reformed United, Inc.

WHEREAS, Prisoners Reformed United has a main goal of ensuring that the public is informed about the organization, as it teaches both returning citizens and communities how to work together; and

WHEREAS, PRUI strives to help build better communities, as the organization believes that everyone suffers when human needs are not met and that the safety of families, schools and neighborhood businesses are compromised when people become emotionally frustrated in their attempts to survive; and

WHEREAS, PRUI is committed to making a difference by transforming the lives of returning citizens and recognizes the value that reformed citizens provide and

WHEREAS, PRUI offers the following services: in-house visits, court advocacy, spiritual counseling, health and wellness and juvenile services; now, therefore:

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY-COUNTY COUNCIL OF THE  
CITY OF INDIANAPOLIS AND OF MARION COUNTY, INDIANA:

SECTION 1. The Indianapolis City-County Council proudly recognizes Prisoners Reformed United, Inc. for sharing messages of life experiences and lessons learned to encourage others.

SECTION 2. The Council encourages PRUI to continue their service for helping those citizens re-entering the community to make successful transitions.

SECTION 3. The Mayor is invited to join in this resolution by affixing his signature hereto.

SECTION 4. This resolution shall be in full force and effect upon adoption and compliance with IC 36-3-4-14.

PROPOSAL NO. 158, 2014. The proposal, sponsored by Councillor Adamson, recognizes April 28, 2014 as Workers Memorial Day. Councillor Adamson read the proposal and presented representatives with copies of the document and Council pins. Councillor Adamson moved, seconded by Councillor Hickman, for adoption. Proposal No. 158, 2014 was adopted by a unanimous voice vote.

Proposal No. 158, 2014 was retitled SPECIAL RESOLUTION NO. 25, 2014, and reads as follows:

CITY-COUNTY SPECIAL RESOLUTION NO. 25, 2014

A SPECIAL RESOLUTION recognizing April 28, 2014 as Workers Memorial Day.

WHEREAS, Workers Memorial Day was established on April 28, 1989; and

WHEREAS, on that day in 1995, the State of Indiana dedicated a memorial statue at West Street and Government Drive to honor all those workers in the State of Indiana who had lost their lives on the job; and

WHEREAS, every year tens of thousands of American workers, including many in our own community, are killed, permanently disabled, injured or made ill by workplace injuries and occupational disease; and

WHEREAS, this year, we continue to mourn those who have died while on active duty fighting on foreign soil, and

WHEREAS, concerned Americans are determined to prevent these tragedies by:

- Observing Workers Memorial Day on April 28, as a day to remember these victims of workplace injuries;
- Renewing efforts to seek stronger safety and health protections, better standards and enforcement and fair and just compensation; and by
- Rededicating ourselves to improving safety and health in every American workplace; now, therefore:

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY-COUNTY COUNCIL OF THE  
CITY OF INDIANAPOLIS AND OF MARION COUNTY, INDIANA:

SECTION 1. The Indianapolis City-County Council joins with others throughout the country to acknowledge those workers who have given their lives and limbs in the name of commerce and industry, and further, that we commit to the adage made famous by Mary Harris "Mother" Jones which reads, "Pray for the dead and fight for the living."

SECTION 2. The Mayor is invited to join in this resolution by affixing his signature hereto.

SECTION 3. This resolution shall be in full force and effect upon adoption and compliance with IC 36-3-4-14.

PROPOSAL NO. 157, 2014. The proposal, sponsored by Councillor Simpson, directs the Clerk to immediately present to the Marion Circuit Court a written report of the facts relating to the administration's refusal to produce documents to the Regional Operations Center Investigating Committee and to seek a court order requiring production. Councillor Simpson read the proposal and moved, seconded by Councillor Talley, for adoption.

Councillor Hunter said that this issue was discussed in committee and was not agreed upon, but the pattern of this investigating committee has been to circumvent the committee process and to conduct business in a way that is not transparent. He said that when he asked Chair Simpson if he

knew of an independent Indiana State Police investigation, he responded in the negative. Yet, later he found that it had been widely circulated among both sides of the body. Councillor Oliver called for a point of order and stated that Councillor Hunter is bringing up items that are not germane to the subject, and people should not be getting into personal accusations.

President Lewis asked for a ruling on Councillor Oliver's call for a point of order. General Counsel Fred Biesecker said that talking about an independent criminal investigation has nothing to do with this proposal, as this proposal is simply requesting documents.

Councillor Hunter stated that each Councillor is allowed two minutes to speak to a proposal, and he has not been allowed that. He added that his comments are germane to what is taking place in the committee that has prompted this proposal, and he has not yet been afforded the courtesy to get around to his point regarding this particular proposal. He said that his point is that this investigation concluded that nothing criminal took place, and this was simply a bad lease. He said that his issue is with how this committee is handling this process. Agendas are sent out at the last minute with meetings that were not on the original agreed-upon schedule, and then they are changed at the last minute right before the meeting. He said that he understands that there are times when a change to the published agenda needs to happen, but it has been a regular pattern with this committee. He said that his desire is that they look for ways to actually make the leasing process better instead of trying to run a separate criminal investigation. He said that when the lease was approved in 2011, he and Councillor Moriarty Adams asked both caucuses if there were any questions, and no one submitted questions until it went to committee, and then answers were provided; and the measure passed in a bi-partisan fashion. He said that they received an e-mail from Corporation Counsel Andy Seiwert stated that Mr. Biesecker agreed to an extension timeline of another week to produce documents. He moved, seconded by Councillor McQuillen, to refer this proposal to committee for further discussion, due to this communication.

Councillor Sandlin said that, as a member of this investigating committee, he should be provided the information he needs to grasp and understand this request for information and the response. He said that this resolution directs the Clerk to send a comprehensive report to the Circuit Court judge, yet he has been asking for comprehensive information for months, as a member of the committee, and has not been afforded the courtesy of receiving information to make an informed decision. As a committee member, he also would like to get a copy of that comprehensive report himself to have a better understanding of what is happening. He said that the power of government to compel has to be carefully measured and done in the right manner, and he would support the motion to refer this proposal to committee.

Councillor Pfisterer said that she asked in committee about the cost of taking this matter through court, and her comments were dismissed. She said she thought the purpose of this committee was to understand that particular lease with an eye to the future for understanding changes that need to be implemented in the lease process. She said that this whole process has been a tempest in a teapot and there has been no public testimony whatsoever. At the last meeting, information was given to the media, but not to committee members and testimony was cut off. Accusations and allegations have been made throughout this process, and she believes this has gotten way off track, and she would like the committee to get back to the purpose of monitoring contracts so that they are not detrimental to the City.

Councillor Gray stated that he is sure the cost of going to court is not near the cost of leasing a building that they cannot use. He said that if Republican members of the committee want this process to move forward and get to improving the lease, then they need to ask the Mayor to release this information.

Councillor Mahern said that he believed this issue would be completed by now, and he raised questions about the details relative to the problems the committee was having a few weeks ago. He said at that time, they were told if there was an additional member placed on this committee, that this would solve the problem. He did not believe that to be the case and felt difficult problems would again make its way back to this Council. He asked if there is a written report in existence today to produce to the courts, or if this is something that will need to be drafted after the Council has voted this evening. Mr. Biesecker said that there is no comprehensive report drafted as yet, but such a report would summarize the many discussions that have taken place at the Regional Operations Center (ROC) Investigating Committee about document production and a list of what has and has not been produced compared to what was requested. He said that this information has been updated as recently as Friday, and is attached to the proposal; but no official report has yet been prepared. Councillor Mahern said that this is the first time he has seen this proposal and these exhibits, and in a need to be transparent, since they are investigating the non-transparency of another body, he would vote to refer the proposal to committee.

Councillor Gray said that all information from this committee have been posted since day one. Mr. Biesecker agreed and said that both the document request and the subpoena are online.

Councillor Freeman said that this committee has not been at all productive in addressing the sole purpose of the committee to solve future problems with leases. He said committee members were given six days' notice of the last committee meeting, and some members plan a life more than six days in advance. Some of his colleagues were handed documents that they had never seen before walking into that meeting, and then found that the agenda that was distributed had been changed when they walked into the meeting. He said that he has asked numerous times for information from Mr. Biesecker to back up the need for a subpoena, and Mr. Biesecker has never responded to him. He said that the first request by the counsel that he saw happened on January 12, 2014 at 1:58 p.m. through an e-mail to Andy Seiwert, Corporation Counsel. To say this has been going on since October is hollow, as the first formal request for documents was made in February. Then the committee changed the rules of the game, added a member to the committee so that it was no longer a non-partisan effort, and issued a subpoena on March 10. He said that this committee, and this full Council body, needs to conduct themselves more professionally, and this needs to be vetted through committee.

President Lewis asked if the notice of the last committee meeting met the public notices guidelines. Mr. Biesecker said that according to the Open Door law, they must advertise a meeting 48 hours prior to the meeting, excluding Saturdays, Sundays and holidays. President Lewis said that she wanted to make sure the laws had been followed.

Councillor Sandlin said that it is not a matter of meeting the public notice guidelines, but unlike other committees, these meeting dates were not pre-published in January for members to set their calendars accordingly. In January, the committee set meeting dates, and committee members, as part-time legislators, set their calendars around those dates. These added meetings were not agreed to when the schedule was set out at the onset of this committee, and therefore, adding meetings at the last minute is frustrating, given all their other responsibilities as elected officials.

Councillor Mahern said that he wants to make it clear that this proposal has not yet been to committee, so they are not actually returning the item to committee, but are referring it to committee for the first time, and the committee members have not yet had any opportunity to give any input on the proposal.

Councillor Miller said that the irony is that they are talking about a lease that turned out bad for the City because they rushed the process, yet now they are talking about sending the issue to court, without any written report of what they want to send to court. He said that this proposal is asking the Council to conceptually approve something that is not even before them. This would be like approving a fiscal ordinance without any numbers before them. He said that he asked for information and was told to go look on the website for the information. He said that it seems Councillors or committee members are being asked to vote on items, then that information should be sent directly to them when requested. He said that on the exhibit, some items are marked as being “unable to locate.” He asked if that means that they do not exist. He said others are noted as “not yet signed,” and asked if that means they are going to subpoena documents that are not yet finalized or signed. He said that it seems unprofessional to discuss sending something to a court when they do not know what that report is.

Councillor Lutz said that a motion to return to committee takes a majority vote, but it is his understanding that a referral to committee only takes eight votes of this body. Mr. Biesecker said that this is a Council resolution, and that reference only applies to special resolutions.

Councillor Mansfield said that if committee members are in the dark, then they are not reading the documents or minutes that have been made available. She said that those who say they do not have the information either cannot read or are not listening. She said that hit has been discussed over and over again. They are now five months down the road in asking for the administration to produce information, and this process is proceeding as it should. She moved to call the question and end debate. Councillor Talley seconded the motion.

Debate was ended on the following roll call vote; viz:

*16 YEAS: Adamson, Barth, Brown, Gray, Hickman, Lewis, Mansfield, Mascari, McQuillen, Moriarty Adams, Oliver, Osili, Robinson, Shreve, Simpson, Talley*  
*13 NAYS: Cain, Evans, Freeman, Gooden, Holliday, Hunter, Lutz, Mahern, McHenry, Miller, Pfisterer, Sandlin, Scales*

The motion to refer Proposal No. 157, 2014 to committee carried on the following roll call vote; viz:

*15 YEAS: Cain, Evans, Freeman, Gooden, Holliday, Hunter, Lutz, Mahern, McHenry, McQuillen, Miller, Moriarty Adams, Pfisterer, Sandlin, Shreve*  
*14 NAYS: Adamson, Barth, Brown, Gray, Hickman, Lewis, Mansfield, Mascari, Oliver, Osili, Robinson, Scales, Simpson, Talley*

Councillor Moriarty Adams stated that she meant to vote against the motion and accidentally pressed the wrong button. She said that she would like to change her vote. Councillor Hunter said that he believes Councillor Moriarty Adams would have to move to “reconsider” the vote to properly change her vote. Mr. Biesecker said that he believes the vote can be re-taken at Councillor Moriarty Adams’ request without a motion to reconsider. Councillor McQuillen stated that he does not agree with the General Counsel’s ruling.

President Lewis asked the Clerk to re-open the board to vote again on the motion to refer Proposal No. 157, 2014 to committee. The motion failed on the following roll call vote; viz:

*14 YEAS: Cain, Evans, Freeman, Gooden, Holliday, Hunter, Lutz, Mahern, McHenry, McQuillen, Miller, Pfisterer, Sandlin, Shreve*

*15 NAYS: Adamson, Barth, Brown, Gray, Hickman, Lewis, Mansfield, Mascari, Moriarty Adams, Oliver, Osili, Robinson, Scales, Simpson, Talley*

Councillor Holliday asked if the Council will be able to read this report sent to the court on the website before it is sent.

Councillor Oliver called the question to end debate on Proposal No. 157, 2014. Councillor Talley seconded the motion, and debate was ended on the following roll call vote; viz:

*17 YEAS: Adamson, Barth, Brown, Cain, Gray, Hickman, Hunter, Lewis, Mansfield, Mascari, Moriarty Adams, Oliver, Osili, Robinson, Scales, Simpson, Talley*  
*12 NAYS: Evans, Freeman, Gooden, Holliday, Lutz, Mahern, McHenry, McQuillen, Miller, Pfisterer, Sandlin, Shreve*

Proposal No. 157, 2014 was adopted on the following roll call vote; viz:

*16 YEAS: Adamson, Barth, Brown, Gray, Hickman, Lewis, Mansfield, Mascari, Moriarty Adams, Oliver, Osili, Pfisterer, Robinson, Scales, Simpson, Talley*  
*13 NAYS: Cain, Evans, Freeman, Gooden, Holliday, Hunter, Lutz, Mahern, McHenry, McQuillen, Miller, Sandlin, Shreve*

Councillor Mahern asked for consent to explain his vote. Consent was given. Councillor Mahern asked how they can exercise judgment on a report that has not yet been produced. He said that he is utterly shocked every time he comes to a Council meeting and the process is overlooked and ignored.

Councillor Pfisterer stated that she voted wrong on the last vote, and asked if her vote could be changed in the record. President Lewis asked the Clerk to open the vote again so that Councillor Pfisterer could change her vote. Proposal No. 157, 2014 was adopted on the following roll call vote; viz:

*15 YEAS: Adamson, Barth, Brown, Gray, Hickman, Lewis, Mansfield, Mascari, Moriarty Adams, Oliver, Osili, Robinson, Scales, Simpson, Talley*  
*14 NAYS: Cain, Evans, Freeman, Gooden, Holliday, Hunter, Lutz, Mahern, McHenry, McQuillen, Miller, Pfisterer, Sandlin, Shreve*

Councillors Miller, Sandlin, Hickman, Brown, McHenry, and Hunter asked for consent to explain their votes. Councillor Miller said that he opposed the proposal, because they are voting on something they do not have in final form. They hold up tax increment financing (TIF) proposals, such as the Avondale/Meadows TIF, all the time for more information, but in this instance have no idea what they are voting on. He said that this is inconsistent with the way this Council normally does business. Councillor Sandlin asked that the comments of Councillors opposing the proposal be provided to the court along with other documentation. He said that he would also like to go to court to personally testify, because he does not believe they have done what they need to do to prepare this to go to court, and he would like to be advised of that court date.

President Lewis asked that minutes from this meeting be included in the documentation and that Council members be alerted as to the court date.

Councillor Hickman clarified that the Avondale/Meadows TIF is not held up due to lack of information. She added that, as Councillors, they are paid to sit through many meetings, and have asked for lots of information. To say that they have been given all the information they ask for at all times is incorrect, and they do not have half of the documentation they have asked for. She

said that the Democrats do not usually receive information any sooner than the rest of the Republican members, and maybe they are just faster readers. She said that she does not understand why members are against this, as this seems to be the only way to actually have transparency. Councillor Brown said that maybe the Council should receive more than a six-day notification of the court date, since it seems many cannot attend without more than a six-day lead time. Councillor McHenry asked if these members get paid for sitting on this committee. The Clerk stated that because this committee consists only of Council members, even though it is a special committee, they are eligible to receive a per diem for these meetings. Councillor Hunter said that it is inappropriate for any member to offer a veiled threat regarding someone else's job or personally insult someone, and they should show more respect to one another and practice some semblance of decorum on the Council floor, regardless of personal opinions on a specific matter. He said that all the members of this body can read and they are allowed legitimate concerns. He added that they also need to follow Roberts Rules of Order, and he just looked up the portion pertaining to changing a member's vote. He said that he was not against another Councillor changing her vote, but the Counsel was wrong in his ruling, and a motion to reconsider the vote, or a consent of the entire body, should have taken place.

Proposal No. 157, 2014 was retitled COUNCIL RESOLUTION NO. 50, 2014, and reads as follows:

CITY-COUNTY COUNCIL RESOLUTION NO. 50, 2014

PROPOSAL for a Council Resolution directing the Clerk of the Council to immediately present to the Marion Circuit Court a written report of the facts relating to the administration's refusal to produce documents to the Regional Operations Center Investigating Committee and to seek a court order requiring production.

WHEREAS, City-County Council Resolution No. 63, 2013 established the Regional Operations Center Investigating Committee; and

WHEREAS, the Committee was granted the power to subpoena witnesses and documents; and

WHEREAS, on March 10, 2014, the Committee authorized the issuance of a document subpoena to the Corporation Counsel, acting on behalf of all city agencies; and

WHEREAS, the subpoena called for production of the identified documents by March 24, 2014 at 10:00 a.m.; and

WHEREAS, on March 24, 2014, after 10:00 a.m., the Corporation Counsel produced some responsive documents, but the overall response was plainly inadequate; and

WHEREAS, on March 26, 2014, the general counsel to the Council sent a detailed description of the gaps in the document production to the Corporation Counsel and requested a complete response to the subpoena by noon on April 2; and

WHEREAS, the Corporation Counsel has produced only a few pages of documents in response to the March 26 communication; now, therefore:

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY-COUNTY COUNCIL OF THE  
CITY OF INDIANAPOLIS AND OF MARION COUNTY, INDIANA:

SECTION 1. Pursuant to Ind. Code § 36-3-4-24(d), the Council hereby orders the Clerk of the Council to immediately present to the Marion Circuit Court a written report of the facts relating to the administration's refusal to produce documents in compliance with the March 10 subpoena, and to seek a court order requiring production of the documents identified in Exhibit A hereto and all other appropriate relief.

SECTION 2. This resolution shall be in full force and effect upon adoption and compliance with IC 36-3-4-14.

PROPOSAL NO. 46, 2014. Councillor Moriarty Adams reported that the Public Safety and Criminal Justice Committee heard Proposal No. 46, 2014 on March 26, 2014. The proposal, sponsored by Councillors Moriarty Adams and Lewis, reappoints Natalie Hipple to the Domestic Violence Fatality Review Team. By a 7-1 vote, the Committee reported the proposal to the Council with the recommendation that it do pass. Councillor Moriarty Adams moved, seconded by Councillor Talley, for adoption. Proposal No. 46, 2014 was adopted on the following roll call vote; viz:

*26 YEAS: Adamson, Barth, Cain, Evans, Freeman, Gooden, Gray, Hickman, Holliday, Hunter, Lewis, Lutz, Mahern, Mascari, McHenry, McQuillen, Miller, Moriarty Adams, Oliver, Osili, Pfisterer, Robinson, Sandlin, Scales, Shreve, Talley*  
*1 NAY: Brown*  
*2 NOT VOTING: Mansfield, Simpson*

Councillor Brown said that Ms. Hipple is doing a good job on the board, but he opposed the proposal because she does not live within Marion County.

Proposal No. 46, 2014 was retitled COUNCIL RESOLUTION NO. 51, 2014, and reads as follows:

CITY-COUNTY COUNCIL RESOLUTION NO. 51, 2014

A COUNCIL RESOLUTION reappointing Natalie Hipple to the Domestic Violence Fatality Review Team.

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY-COUNTY COUNCIL OF THE  
CITY OF INDIANAPOLIS AND OF MARION COUNTY, INDIANA:

SECTION 1. As a member of the Domestic Violence Fatality Review Team, the Council reappoints:

Natalie Hipple

SECTION 2. The appointment made by this resolution is for a term ending December 31, 2015. The person appointed by this resolution shall serve at the pleasure of the Council and for sixty (60) days after the expiration of such term or until such earlier date as successor is appointed and qualifies.

PROPOSAL NO. 55, 2014. Councillor Barth reported that the Rules and Public Policy Committee heard Proposal No. 55, 2014 on March 18, 2014. The proposal, sponsored by Councillors Lewis and Barth, approves Richard Downing as a person who may be appointed to certain Common Construction Wage Committees. By a 5-0 vote, the Committee reported the proposal to the Council with the recommendation that it do pass. Councillor Barth moved, seconded by Councillor Gray, for adoption. Proposal No. 55, 2014 was adopted on the following roll call vote; viz:

*29 YEAS: Adamson, Barth, Brown, Cain, Evans, Freeman, Gooden, Gray, Hickman, Holliday, Hunter, Lewis, Lutz, Mahern, Mansfield, Mascari, McHenry, McQuillen, Miller, Moriarty Adams, Oliver, Osili, Pfisterer, Robinson, Sandlin, Scales, Shreve, Simpson*  
*0 NAYS:*

Proposal No. 55, 2014 was retitled COUNCIL RESOLUTION NO. 52, 2014, and reads as follows:

CITY-COUNTY COUNCIL RESOLUTION NO. 52, 2014

A COUNCIL RESOLUTION approving Richard Downing as a person who may be appointed to certain Common Construction Wage Committees.



April 14, 2014

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY-COUNTY COUNCIL OF THE  
CITY OF INDIANAPOLIS AND OF MARION COUNTY, INDIANA:

SECTION 1. Pursuant to Sections 282-204 and 205 of the Revised Code, the Council hereby approves Richard Downing as a person who may be appointed by the council president to serve on common construction wage committees for the taxing units of Lawrence Township, City of Lawrence, Metropolitan School District of Lawrence Township, Marion County and other county-wide taxing units, and Consolidated City taxing units.

SECTION 2. The approval granted by this resolution shall continue until the council revokes it by resolution.

Councillor Robinson reported that the Metropolitan and Economic Development Committee heard Proposal No. 67 and 71, 2014 on March 31, 2014. He asked for consent to vote on these proposals together. Consent was given.

PROPOSAL NO. 67, 2014. The proposal, sponsored by Councillors Lewis and Barth, reappoints Mary Clark to the Metropolitan Board of Zoning Appeals, Division I. PROPOSAL NO. 71, 2014. The proposal, sponsored by Councillors Lewis and Barth, reappoints Jennifer Keefe to the Metropolitan Board of Zoning Appeals, Division III. By 6-0 votes, the Committee reported the proposals to the Council with the recommendation that they do pass.

Councillor Hunter said that he supports the reappointment of Ms. Clark, as her commitment is second-to-none.

Councillor Robinson moved, seconded by Councillor Adamson, for adoption. Proposal No. 67, 2014 was adopted on the following roll call vote; viz:

*29 YEAS: Adamson, Barth, Brown, Cain, Evans, Freeman, Gooden, Gray, Hickman, Holliday, Hunter, Lewis, Lutz, Mahern, Mansfield, Mascari, McHenry, McQuillen, Miller, Moriarty Adams, Oliver, Osili, Pfisterer, Robinson, Sandlin, Scales, Shreve, Simpson*  
*0 NAYS:*

Proposal No. 67, 2014 was retitled COUNCIL RESOLUTION NO. 53, 2014, and reads as follows:

CITY-COUNTY COUNCIL RESOLUTION NO. 53, 2014

A COUNCIL RESOLUTION reappointing Mary Clark to the Metropolitan Board of Zoning Appeals, Division I.

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY-COUNTY COUNCIL OF THE  
CITY OF INDIANAPOLIS AND OF MARION COUNTY, INDIANA:

SECTION 1. As a member of the Metropolitan Board of Zoning Appeals, Division I, the Council reappoints:

Mary Clark

SECTION 2. The reappointment made by this resolution is for a term ending December 31, 2014. The person appointed by this resolution shall serve at the pleasure of the Council and until his successor is appointed and qualifies unless the duration of the holdover period for this office is limited by statute.

Proposal No. 71, 2014 was retitled COUNCIL RESOLUTION NO. 54, 2014, and reads as follows:

CITY-COUNTY COUNCIL RESOLUTION NO. 54, 2014

A COUNCIL RESOLUTION reappointing Jennifer Keefe to the Metropolitan Board of Zoning Appeals, Division III.

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY-COUNTY COUNCIL OF THE  
CITY OF INDIANAPOLIS AND OF MARION COUNTY, INDIANA:

SECTION 1. As a member of the Metropolitan Board of Zoning Appeals, Division III, the Council reappoints:

Jennifer Keefe

SECTION 2. The reappointment made by this resolution is for a term ending December 31, 2014. The person appointed by this resolution shall serve at the pleasure of the Council and until his successor is appointed and qualifies unless the duration of the holdover period for this office is limited by statute.

PROPOSAL NO. 78, 2014 Councillor Moriarty Adams reported that the Public Safety and Criminal Justice Committee heard Proposal No. 46, 2014 on March 26, 2014. The proposal, sponsored by Councillors Barth and Moriarty Adams, appoints Stacie Hurre to the Animal Care and Control Board. By a 8-0 vote, the Committee reported the proposal to the Council with the recommendation that it do pass. Councillor Moriarty Adams moved, seconded by Councillor Oliver, for adoption. Proposal No. 78, 2014 was adopted on the following roll call vote; viz:

*27 YEAS: Adamson, Barth, Brown, Cain, Evans, Freeman, Gooden, Gray, Hickman, Holliday, Hunter, Lewis, Lutz, Mahern, Mansfield, Mascari, McHenry, Miller, Moriarty Adams, Oliver, Osili, Pfisterer, Robinson, Sandlin, Scales, Shreve, Simpson*

*0 NAYS:*

*2 NOT VOTING: McQuillen, Talley*

Proposal No. 78, 2014 was retitled COUNCIL RESOLUTION NO. 55, 2014, and reads as follows:

CITY-COUNTY COUNCIL RESOLUTION NO. 55, 2014

A COUNCIL RESOLUTION appointing Stacie Hurre to the Animal Care and Control Board.

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY-COUNTY COUNCIL OF THE  
CITY OF INDIANAPOLIS AND OF MARION COUNTY, INDIANA:

SECTION 1. As a member of the Animal Care and Control Board, the Council appoints:

Stacie Hurre

SECTION 2. The appointment made by this resolution is for a term ending December 31, 2014. The person appointed by this resolution shall serve at the pleasure of the Council and for sixty (60) days after the expiration of such term or until such earlier date as successor is appointed and qualifies.

PROPOSAL NO. 81, 2014. Councillor Brown reported that the Public Works Committee heard Proposal No. 81, 2014 on April 3, 2014. The proposal, sponsored by Councillors Gray and Brown, appoints Curtis Holtz to the Board of Public Works. By a 7-0 vote, the Committee reported the proposal to the Council with the recommendation that it do pass. Councillor Brown moved, seconded by Councillor Gray, for adoption. Proposal No. 81, 2014 was adopted on the following roll call vote; viz:

*27 YEAS: Adamson, Barth, Brown, Cain, Evans, Freeman, Gooden, Gray, Hickman, Holliday, Hunter, Lewis, Lutz, Mahern, Mansfield, Mascari, McHenry, Miller, Moriarty Adams, Oliver, Osili, Pfisterer, Robinson, Sandlin, Scales, Shreve, Simpson*

*0 NAYS:*

*2 NOT VOTING: McQuillen, Talley*

*April 14, 2014*

Proposal No. 81, 2014 was retitled COUNCIL RESOLUTION NO. 56, 2014, and reads as follows:

**CITY-COUNTY COUNCIL RESOLUTION NO. 56, 2014**

A COUNCIL RESOLUTION appointing Curtis Holtz to the Board of Public Works.

**BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY-COUNTY COUNCIL OF THE  
CITY OF INDIANAPOLIS AND OF MARION COUNTY, INDIANA:**

SECTION 1. As a member of the Board of Public Works, the Council appoints:

Curtis Holtz

SECTION 2. The appointment made by this resolution is for a term ending December 31, 2014. The person appointed by this resolution shall serve at the pleasure of the Council and for sixty (60) days after the expiration of such term or until such earlier date as successor is appointed and qualifies.

**INTRODUCTION OF PROPOSALS**

PROPOSAL NO. 101, 2014. Introduced by Councillors Lewis, Barth, Moriarty Adams and Gooden. The Clerk read the proposal entitled: "A Proposal for a Special Ordinance which defines eligibility for Public Employees' Retirement Fund (PERF) participation for City and County employees and authorizes the Controller to establish and administer a Defined Contribution Plan"; and the President referred it to the Administration and Finance Committee.

PROPOSAL NO. 102, 2014. Introduced by Councillors Lewis, Moriarty Adams and Barth. The Clerk read the proposal entitled: "A Proposal for a General Ordinance which amends the City of Indianapolis and Marion County's deferred compensation plan"; and the President referred it to the Administration and Finance Committee.

PROPOSAL NO. 103, 2014. Introduced by Councillors Lewis, Barth, Gooden and Moriarty Adams. The Clerk read the proposal entitled: "A Proposal for a General Ordinance which authorizes the Controller to establish and administer a Governmental 401(a) Special Pay Plan"; and the President referred it to the Administration and Finance Committee.

PROPOSAL NO. 104, 2014. Introduced by Councillors Lewis, Barth and Moriarty Adams. The Clerk read the proposal entitled: "A Proposal for a General Ordinance which amends Chapter 291, Article IV of the Code regarding eligibility for participation in the deferred compensation plan"; and the President referred it to the Administration and Finance Committee.

PROPOSAL NO. 105, 2014. Introduced by Councillors Lewis and Moriarty Adams. The Clerk read the proposal entitled: "A Proposal for a General Ordinance which amends Chapter 141, Article I of the Code regarding city and county contracts"; and the President referred it to the Administration and Finance Committee.

PROPOSAL NO. 106, 2014. Introduced by Councillor McQuillen. The Clerk read the proposal entitled: "A Proposal for a Council Resolution which confirms the mayor's reappointment of Daniel Ladendorf to the City-County Ethics Commission"; and the President referred it to the Ethics Committee.

PROPOSAL NO. 107, 2014. Introduced by Councillor McQuillen. The Clerk read the proposal entitled: "A Proposal for a Council Resolution which confirms the mayor's reappointment of Leslie Hiner to the City-County Ethics Commission"; and the President referred it to the Ethics Committee.

PROPOSAL NO. 108, 2014. Introduced by Councillor McQuillen. The Clerk read the proposal entitled: "A Proposal for a Council Resolution which confirms the mayor's reappointment of Peggy Boehm to the City-County Ethics Commission"; and the President referred it to the Ethics Committee.

PROPOSAL NO. 109, 2014. Introduced by Councillor McQuillen. The Clerk read the proposal entitled: "A Proposal for a Council Resolution which confirms the mayor's reappointment of Sondra Gunnell to the City-County Ethics Commission"; and the President referred it to the Ethics Committee.

PROPOSAL NO. 110, 2014. Introduced by Councillor McQuillen. The Clerk read the proposal entitled: "A Proposal for a Council Resolution which confirms the mayor's reappointment of Gary Roberts to the City-County Ethics Commission"; and the President referred it to the Ethics Committee.

PROPOSAL NO. 111, 2014. Introduced by Councillors Barth and Lewis. The Clerk read the proposal entitled: "A Proposal for a Council Resolution which appoints Matthew Albaugh to the Indianapolis City Market Corporation Board of Directors"; and the President referred it to the Metropolitan and Economic Development Committee.

PROPOSAL NO. 112, 2014. Introduced by Councillors Hunter, Barth and Lewis. The Clerk read the proposal entitled: "A Proposal for a Council Resolution which appoints Michael Solari to the Indianapolis City Market Corporation Board of Directors"; and the President referred it to the Metropolitan and Economic Development Committee.

PROPOSAL NO. 113, 2014. Introduced by Councillor Evans. The Clerk read the proposal entitled: "A Proposal for a General Resolution which approves the statement of benefits for Heartland Food Products Group and North by Northwest Ab Biynah LLC as an applicant for tax abatement for property located in an economic revitalization area"; and the President referred it to the Metropolitan and Economic Development Committee.

PROPOSAL NO. 114, 2014. Introduced by Councillors Adamson and Gooden. The Clerk read the proposal entitled: "A Proposal for a Fiscal Ordinance which approves a reduction of \$100,373.44 in the 2014 Budget of the Department of Metropolitan Development (Transportation General and Consolidated County Funds) for the purpose of correcting a funding split between federal grant dollars and local matching funds"; and the President referred it to the Metropolitan and Economic Development Committee.

PROPOSAL NO. 115, 2014. Introduced by Councillors Moriarty Adams and Miller. The Clerk read the proposal entitled: "A Proposal for a Fiscal Ordinance which approves an appropriation of \$150,000 in the 2014 Budget of the Department of Metropolitan Development (Redevelopment General Fund) for utility relocation expenses at the Central Greens site"; and the President referred it to the Metropolitan and Economic Development Committee.

PROPOSAL NO. 116, 2014. Introduced by Councillors Moriarty Adams and Miller. The Clerk read the proposal entitled: "A Proposal for a Fiscal Ordinance which approves an appropriation

of \$200,000 in the 2014 Budget of the Department of Metropolitan Development (Consolidated County Fund) in case of emergency maintenance expenses for City-owned properties"; and the President referred it to the Metropolitan and Economic Development Committee.

PROPOSAL NO. 117, 2014. Introduced by Councillors Moriarty Adams and Miller. The Clerk read the proposal entitled: "A Proposal for a Fiscal Ordinance which approves an appropriation of \$800,000 in the 2014 Budget of the Department of Metropolitan Development (Consolidated County Fund) for Housing Trust Fund programs"; and the President referred it to the Metropolitan and Economic Development Committee.

PROPOSAL NO. 118, 2014. Introduced by Councillors Moriarty Adams and Miller. The Clerk read the proposal entitled: "A Proposal for a Fiscal Ordinance which approves an appropriation of \$6,290,570 in the 2014 Budget of the Department of Metropolitan Development (Federal Grants Fund) in order to utilize prior year awards"; and the President referred it to the Metropolitan and Economic Development Committee.

PROPOSAL NO. 119, 2014. Introduced by Councillors Moriarty Adams and Miller. The Clerk read the proposal entitled: "A Proposal for a Fiscal Ordinance which approves an appropriation of \$37,700,000 in the 2014 Budget of the Department of Metropolitan Development (Non-Lapsing Federal Grants Fund) for the Section 108 Loan Program"; and the President referred it to the Metropolitan and Economic Development Committee.

PROPOSAL NO. 121, 2014. Introduced by Councillors Simpson and Holliday. The Clerk read the proposal entitled: "A Proposal for a Fiscal Ordinance which approves an appropriation of \$648,876 in the 2014 Budget of the Department of Parks and Recreation (Federal Grants Fund) to utilize grant dollars to fund the expansion of the Summer and Afterschool Food programs"; and the President referred it to the Parks and Recreation Committee.

PROPOSAL NO. 122, 2014. Introduced by Councillors Moriarty Adams, Barth and Lewis. The Clerk read the proposal entitled: "A Proposal for a Council Resolution which reappoints Jennifer Lukemeyer to the Marion County Public Defender Board"; and the President referred it to the Public Safety and Criminal Justice Committee.

PROPOSAL NO. 123, 2014. Introduced by Councillors Moriarty Adams, Barth and Lewis. The Clerk read the proposal entitled: "A Proposal for a Council Resolution which reappoints Robert Hammerle to the Marion County Public Defender Board"; and the President referred it to the Public Safety and Criminal Justice Committee.

PROPOSAL NO. 124, 2014. Introduced by Councillor Mansfield. The Clerk read the proposal entitled: "A Proposal for a Fiscal Ordinance which approves a reduction in appropriations of \$956,647 in the 2014 Budget of the Department of Public Safety (City Cumulative Capital Development Fund) to align total appropriations with the statutory budget limit set by the Department of Local Government Finance in the 2014 Marion County Budget Order (A separate fiscal ordinance is being submitted to restore appropriations for agencies to operate at the level of appropriations previously approved by the Council.)"; and the President referred it to the Public Safety and Criminal Justice Committee.

PROPOSAL NO. 125, 2014. Introduced by Councillor Moriarty Adams. The Clerk read the proposal entitled: "A Proposal for a Fiscal Ordinance which approves a transfer of \$223,700 in the 2014 Budget of the Department of Public Safety (IMPD General Fund) for the wellness

portion of the Public Safety Medical contract"; and the President referred it to the Public Safety and Criminal Justice Committee.

PROPOSAL NO. 126, 2014. Introduced by Councillor Moriarty Adams. The Clerk read the proposal entitled: "A Proposal for a Fiscal Ordinance which approves a transfer of \$437,000 in the 2014 Budget of the Department of Public Safety (IFD General Fund) for the wellness portion of the Public Safety Medical contract"; and the President referred it to the Public Safety and Criminal Justice Committee.

PROPOSAL NO. 127, 2014. Introduced by Councillors Moriarty Adams and Pfisterer. The Clerk read the proposal entitled: "A Proposal for a Fiscal Ordinance which approves an appropriation of \$5,000,000 in the 2014 Budget of the Department of Public Safety (City Cumulative Capital Fund) for patrol vehicles, animal transport vans, fire apparatus and maintenance for the outdoor siren warning system"; and the President referred it to the Public Safety and Criminal Justice Committee.

PROPOSAL NO. 128, 2014. Introduced by Councillor Moriarty Adams. The Clerk read the proposal entitled: "A Proposal for a Special Resolution which approves a contract to provide enhanced emergency (9-1-1) systems and service between the Marion County Sheriff and SBC Global Services"; and the President referred it to the Public Safety and Criminal Justice Committee.

PROPOSAL NO. 129, 2014. Introduced by Councillor Moriarty Adams. The Clerk read the proposal entitled: "A Proposal for a General Resolution which amends Section 1 of General Resolution No. 25, 2013 regarding the approval of certain public purpose grants totaling \$300,000 from the Drug Free Community Fund "; and the President referred it to the Public Safety and Criminal Justice Committee.

PROPOSAL NO. 130, 2014. Introduced by Councillor Brown. The Clerk read the proposal entitled: "A Proposal for a Fiscal Ordinance which approves an appropriation of \$7,000,000 in the 2014 Budget of the Department of Public Works (Transportation General Fund) for unanticipated expenses related to 2014 snow removal"; and the President referred it to the Public Works Committee.

PROPOSAL NO. 131, 2014. Introduced by Councillor Moriarty Adams. The Clerk read the proposal entitled: "A Proposal for a General Ordinance which authorizes intersection controls at Layman Avenue and 27th Street (District 17)"; and the President referred it to the Public Works Committee.

PROPOSAL NO. 132, 2014. Introduced by Councillor Freeman. The Clerk read the proposal entitled: "A Proposal for a General Ordinance which authorizes intersection controls for the Thompson Park subdivision (District 25)"; and the President referred it to the Public Works Committee.

PROPOSAL NO. 133, 2014. Introduced by Councillor Shreve. The Clerk read the proposal entitled: "A Proposal for a General Ordinance which authorizes intersection controls for Barnwell Way, Glenwick Boulevard, and Nanwich Court (District 23)"; and the President referred it to the Public Works Committee.

PROPOSAL NO. 134, 2014. Introduced by Councillor Evans. The Clerk read the proposal entitled: "A Proposal for a General Ordinance which authorizes parking restrictions on Coffman

Road from 62nd to 71st Street (District 1)"; and the President referred it to the Public Works Committee.

PROPOSAL NO. 135, 2014. Introduced by Councillor Scales. The Clerk read the proposal entitled: "A Proposal for a General Ordinance which authorizes intersection controls and a reduction in speed limit for the Crystal Lake at River Ridge subdivision (District 4) "; and the President referred it to the Public Works Committee.

PROPOSAL NO. 136, 2014. Introduced by Councillor Moriarty Adams. The Clerk read the proposal entitled: "A Proposal for a General Ordinance which authorizes a change of intersection controls at Bolton Avenue and 12th Street (District 17)"; and the President referred it to the Public Works Committee.

PROPOSAL NO. 137, 2014. Introduced by Councillor Hunter. The Clerk read the proposal entitled: "A Proposal for a General Ordinance which amends the Code to amend regulations applicable to breweries and distilleries"; and the President referred it to the Rules and Public Policy Committee.

### **SPECIAL ORDERS - PRIORITY BUSINESS**

PROPOSAL NOS. 146-156. Introduced by Councillor Robinson. Proposal Nos. 146-156, 2014 are proposals for Rezoning Ordinances certified by the Metropolitan Development Commission on April 4, 2014. The President called for any motions for public hearings on any of those zoning maps changes. There being no motions for public hearings, the proposed ordinances, pursuant to IC 36-7-4-608, took effect as if adopted by the City-County Council, were retitled for identification as REZONING ORDINANCE NOS. 21-31, 2014, the original copies of which ordinances are on file with the Metropolitan Development Commission, which were certified as follows:

REZONING ORDINANCE NO. 21, 2014.

2013-ZON-022

4201 MOLLER ROAD (*Approximate Address*)

INDIANAPOLIS, PIKE TOWNSHIP

COUNCIL DISTRICT # 7

GREATER REFORMATION MINISTRIES, by John Bennett, requests Rezoning of 4.64 acres, being in the D-P District, to the SU-1 classification to provide for religious uses.

REZONING ORDINANCE NO. 22, 2014.

2013-ZON-070

6725 SOUTH FRANKLIN ROAD (*Approximate Address*)

FRANKLIN TOWNSHIP, CD # 25

AJ PARTNERSHIP, by David A. Retherford, requests Rezoning of three acres from the D-A district to the C-3 classification to provide for a gas station and convenience store.

REZONING ORDINANCE NO. 23, 2014.

2013-ZON-074

4903 AND 4907 WINTHROP AVENUE (*Approximate Address*)

WASHINGTON TOWNSHIP, CD # 9

WILLIAM A. NEWTON AND LINDA L. NEWTON, TRUSTEES OF THE LINDA L. NEWTON LIVING TRUST, by David and Justin Kingen, requests Rezoning of 0.33 acre from the D-5 (W-1) district to the C-S (W-1) classification to provide for a hostel, a yoga fitness facility and studio, an employee apartment, an indoor/outdoor event center for weddings, small parties, festivals, concerts, recitals with live entertainment, outside cooking and dining for hostel occupants and guests, single-family dwelling units, neighborhood crime watch meetings, and with a detached garage expansion, with a second floor dwelling unit.

REZONING ORDINANCE NO. 24, 2014.

2013-ZON-077

2821-2841 (ODD), 2911, AND 2919 TROPICAL DRIVE (*Approximate Address*)

WASHINGTON TOWNSHIP, CD # 4

WATER EDGE ON HERON LAKE, LLC, by David and Justin Kingen, requests Rezoning of 0.78 acre from the D-9 (W-5) District to the D-8 classification to provide for residential development.

REZONING ORDINANCE NO. 25, 2014.

2013-ZON-078

1720 EAST 38<sup>TH</sup> STREET (*Approximate Address*)

WASHINGTON TOWNSHIP, CD # 9

GARY HOBBS, by Lewis Kinhead, requests Rezoning of 1.52 acres from the C-4 (W-1) district to the C-3C (W-1) classification to provide for mixed-use development, including multi-family residential and commercial uses.

REZONING ORDINANCE NO. 26, 2014.

2013-ZON-079

5805 EAST SOUTHPORT ROAD (*Approximate Address*)

FRANKLIN TOWNSHIP, CD # 25

BRAD SHAFFER, by David A. Retherford, requests Rezoning of 24 acres from the D-A district to the D-2 classification to provide for single-family development.

REZONING ORDINANCE NO. 27, 2014.

2014-ZON-001

143 WEST 40<sup>TH</sup> STREET (*Approximate Address*)

WASHINGTON TOWNSHIP, CD # 8

BARRY LOGAN requests Rezoning of 0.22 acre, from the SU-1 District, to the D-5 classification to provide for residential development.

REZONING ORDINANCE NO. 28, 2014.

2014-ZON-002

5432 SOUTH EAST STREET (*Approximate Address*)

PERRY TOWNSHIP, CD # 23

MANNA INVESTMENTS, LLC, by Pierre Braganza, requests Rezoning of 0.5-acre from the D-A district to the C-3 classification to provide for commercial development.

REZONING ORDINANCE NO. 29, 2014.

2014-ZON-004

534 EAST MICHIGAN STREET

CENTER TOWNSHIP, CD # 9

NEIGHBORHOOD DOWNTOWN ZONING ASSISTANCE, by David Kingen, requests Rezoning of 1.13 acres, from the I-3-U (HPS) District to the CBD-2 classification.

REZONING ORDINANCE NO. 30, 2014.

2013-CZN-821

5915 AND 5925 NORTH COLLEGE AVENUE

WASHINGTON TOWNSHIP, CD # 3

59<sup>th</sup> AND COLLEGE, LLC, by Michael Rabinowitch, requests Rezoning of 0.30 acre from the D-5 District to the C-2 classification to provide for commercial development.

REZONING ORDINANCE NO. 31, 2014.

2013-CZN-838

5540 SOUTH EAST STREET

PERRY TOWNSHIP, CD # 23

H & H INDY DQ DEVELOPMENT, LLC, by Kenneth Zumstein, requests Rezoning of 0.77 acre from the C-S district to the C-3 classification to provide for a drive-through fast-food restaurant.

### **SPECIAL ORDERS - PUBLIC HEARING**

PROPOSAL NO. 80, 2014. Councillor Moriarty Adams reported that the Public Safety and Criminal Justice Committee heard Proposal No. 80, 2014 on March 26, 2014. The proposal,



sponsored by Councillors Moriarty Adams and Pfisterer, approves an additional appropriation of \$44,000 in the 2014 Budget of the Marion Superior Court (Community Court Program, County Grants, and Drug Treatment Diversion Funds) to provide staff training for Community Court, implement the Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative, and cover personnel and equipment costs for the Marion County Drug Treatment Court. By an 8-0 vote, the Committee reported the proposal to the Council with the recommendation that it do pass.

The President called for public testimony at 9:13 p.m. There being no one present to testify, Councillor Moriarty Adams moved, seconded by Councillor Talley, for adoption. Proposal No. 80, 2014 was adopted on the following roll call vote; viz:

29 YEAS: Adamson, Barth, Brown, Cain, Evans, Freeman, Gooden, Gray, Hickman, Holliday, Hunter, Lewis, Lutz, Mahern, Mansfield, Mascari, McHenry, McQuillen, Miller, Moriarty Adams, Oliver, Osili, Pfisterer, Robinson, Sandlin, Scales, Shreve, Simpson  
0 NAYS:

Proposal No. 80, 2014 was retitled FISCAL ORDINANCE NO. 14, 2014, and reads as follows:

CITY-COUNTY FISCAL ORDINANCE NO. 14, 2014

A FISCAL ORDINANCE amending the City-County Annual Budget for 2014 (City-County Fiscal Ordinance No. 270, 2013) by appropriating a total of \$44,000 for purposes of the Marion Superior Court.

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY-COUNTY COUNCIL OF THE  
CITY OF INDIANAPOLIS AND OF MARION COUNTY, INDIANA:

SECTION 1. To provide for expenditures the necessity for which has arisen since its adoption, the City-County Annual Budget for 2014 is hereby amended by the increases and reductions hereinafter stated for purposes of the Marion Superior Court.

SECTION 2. The Marion Superior Court, appropriation in the Community Court Program Fund to provide staff training. The following changes to appropriations are hereby approved:

<u>FUND</u>	<u>CHAR 1</u>	<u>CHAR 2</u>	<u>CHAR 3</u>	<u>CHAR 4</u>	<u>CHAR 5</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
Community Court Program			5,000			5,000

SECTION 3. The Marion Superior Court, appropriation in the County Grants Fund for the Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative awarded by the Annie E. Casey Foundation and to fund partial salary expenses for a Community Court work crew leader. The following changes to appropriations are hereby approved:

<u>FUND</u>	<u>CHAR 1</u>	<u>CHAR 2</u>	<u>CHAR 3</u>	<u>CHAR 4</u>	<u>CHAR 5</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
County Grants	10,400	\$7,000	1,600			19,000

There is no local match requirement.

SECTION 4. The Marion Superior Court, appropriation in the Drug Treatment Diversion Fund to cover partial salary, fringe benefits and unemployment claims of Drug Treatment Court staff and to purchase tablets for wireless case management. The following changes to appropriations are hereby approved:

<u>FUND</u>	<u>CHAR 1</u>	<u>CHAR 2</u>	<u>CHAR 3</u>	<u>CHAR 4</u>	<u>CHAR 5</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
Drug Treatment Diversion	15,000			5,000		20,000

SECTION 5. Upon approval of this, and other pending approvals, the 2013 year end and projected 2014 year end fund balances are as follows:

	Projected 2013 year-end balance	Projected 2014 year-end balance
Drug Treatment Diversion Fund	63,265	48,588
Community Court Program Fund	9,450	4,450

SECTION 6. Except to the extent of matching funds, if any, approved in this ordinance, the council does not intend to use the revenues from any local tax regardless of source to supplement or extend the appropriation for the agencies or projects authorized by this ordinance. The supervisor of the agency or project, or both, and the controller are directed to notify in writing the city-county council immediately upon receipt of any information that the agency or project is, or may be, reduced or eliminated.

SECTION 7. This ordinance shall be in full force and effect upon adoption and compliance with IC 36-3-4-14.

### **SPECIAL ORDERS - FINAL ADOPTION**

PROPOSAL NO. 137, 2013. Councillor Moriarty Adams reported that the Public Safety and Criminal Justice Committee heard Proposal No. 137, 2013 on May 22, 2013, August 28, 2013, February 5, 2014 and March 26, 2014. The proposal, sponsored by Councillor Brown, amends the Code to reduce the number of unnecessary police and fire runs by improving the processes for the prevention of false alarms and the enforcement of false alarm violations. By an 8-0 vote, the Committee reported the proposal to the Council with the recommendation that it do pass as amended. Councillor Moriarty Adams moved, seconded by Councillor Gray, for adoption. Proposal No. 137, 2013 was adopted on the following roll call vote; viz:

*29 YEAS: Adamson, Barth, Brown, Cain, Evans, Freeman, Gooden, Gray, Hickman, Holliday, Hunter, Lewis, Lutz, Mahern, Mansfield, Mascari, McHenry, McQuillen, Miller, Moriarty Adams, Oliver, Osili, Pfisterer, Robinson, Sandlin, Scales, Shreve, Simpson*  
*0 NAYS:*

Councillor Brown stated that this process began three years ago, and he thanked the Office of Finance and Management (OFM), the Office of Corporation Counsel (OCC), and the Department of Public Safety (DPS) for their help and support.

Proposal No. 137, 2013 was retitled GENERAL ORDINANCE NO. 4, 2014, and reads as follows:

#### **CITY-COUNTY GENERAL ORDINANCE NO. 4, 2014**

A PROPOSAL FOR A GENERAL ORDINANCE amending the Revised Code of the Consolidated City and County to reduce the number of unnecessary police and fire runs by improving the processes for the prevention of false alarms and the enforcement of false alarm violations.

#### **BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY-COUNTY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF INDIANAPOLIS AND OF MARION COUNTY, INDIANA:**

SECTION 1. Section 811-111 of the "Revised Code of the Consolidated City and County," regarding the purpose of Chapter 811 of the Revised Code, hereby is amended by the deletion of the language that is stricken-through, and by the addition of the language that is underscored, to read as follows:

Sec. 811-111. Purpose.

(a) It is hereby declared to be the purpose of this chapter to reduce the number of false alarms activated by private emergency alarm systems and thereby reduce the city's commitment of law enforcement resources required to answer these false alarms.

(b) In furtherance of this purpose and in addition to the other duties and responsibilities listed in this chapter, the ~~alarm administrator~~ department of public safety from time to time shall consult with representatives of the community,

the alarm industry, and law enforcement agencies to evaluate and improve the effectiveness of false alarm reduction efforts.

SECTION 2. Section 811-112 of the "Revised Code of the Consolidated City and County," regarding definitions that apply to Chapter 811 of the Revised Code, hereby is amended by the deletion of the language that is stricken-through, and by the addition of the language that is underscored, to read as follows:

Sec. 811-112. Definitions.

As used in this chapter, the following terms shall have the meanings ascribed to them in this section.

*Alarm administrator* means the person designated by the director of the department of public safety to discharge the duties and responsibilities as prescribed in this chapter. The alarm administrator shall be an employee of the department.

*Alarm business* means any individual, partnership, corporation or other entity which does any of the following: monitors, leases, maintains, services, repairs, alters, replaces, moves or installs any alarm system or causes to be sold, leased, maintained, serviced, repaired, altered, replaced, moved or installed any alarm system in or on any building, structure, facility or grounds.

*Alarm system* means any device used for the detection of an unauthorized entry or attempted entry into a building, structure, facility or grounds, or for alerting others of the commission of an unlawful act within a building, structure, facility or grounds, or for fire detection, which when activated causes notification to be made directly or indirectly to the ~~Indianapolis metropolitan police~~ department of public safety.

For the purposes of this chapter, alarm system shall not include:

- (1) An alarm installed on a motor vehicle;
- (2) An alarm designed so that the ~~Indianapolis metropolitan police~~ department of public safety is not notified until after the occupants, an agent of the owner or lessee, or an agent of an alarm system business has checked the alarm site and determined that the alarm was the result of criminal activity of the kind for which the alarm system was designed to give notice;
- (3) An alarm which signals or alerts only the occupants of the premises protected by the alarm system, including an alarm located on a private residence if the only response on activation of the alarm system is a sounding alarm that automatically stops within fifteen (15) minutes after activation; or
- (4) An alarm installed upon premises occupied by the United States of America, the state or any political subdivision thereof.

*False alarm* means an alarm eliciting a ~~police~~ response by police or fire personnel when the situation does not require police or fire services. For the purposes of this chapter, this does not include alarms triggered by severe atmospheric conditions or other circumstances not reasonably under the control of the alarm user, installer or maintainer.

*Monitor or monitoring* means the detection from a remote location of the activation of an alarm system subject to this chapter.

SECTION 3. Section 811-211 of the "Revised Code of the Consolidated City and County," regarding alarm business licenses, hereby is amended by the deletion of the language that is stricken-through, and by the addition of the language that is underscored, to read as follows:

Sec. 811-211. License required.

It shall be unlawful for an alarm business to operate in the city by engaging in any activity described in the definition of alarm business in section 811-112 of this Code, without first having obtained a license therefor from the ~~alarm~~ license administrator.

SECTION 4. Section 811-212 of the "Revised Code of the Consolidated City and County," regarding applications for alarm business licenses, hereby is amended by the deletion of the language that is stricken-through, and by the addition of the language that is underscored, to read as follows:

Sec. 811-212. Application for license.

(a) All applications for a license required by this article shall be made on forms designed by the ~~alarm license~~ administrator and shall include the following information in addition to the information required in Section 801-203:

- ~~(1) The full name and address of the alarm business;~~
- (21) The full name, business address and home address of the owner or manager of the alarm business; and
- ~~(32)~~ A telephone number at which the ~~Indianapolis metropolitan police~~ department of public safety can notify personnel of the alarm business of a need for assistance at any time.

(b) An alarm business shall promptly notify the ~~alarm license~~ administrator in writing of any change in the information contained in the application form.

SECTION 5. Section 811-213 of the "Revised Code of the Consolidated City and County," regarding license fees and terms for alarm business licenses, hereby is amended by the deletion of the language that is stricken-through, and by the addition of the language that is underscored, to read as follows:

Sec. 811-213. License fee and term.

~~(a) An alarm business license shall be valid for one (1) year and shall be renewable on the first day of January of each year.~~

(ba) The annual license fee for each alarm business shall be provided in section 131-501 of the Code.

(eb) An alarm business license shall be personal to the holder and is not transferable.

SECTION 6. Section 811-215 of the "Revised Code of the Consolidated City and County," regarding reporting requirements for alarm businesses, hereby is amended by the deletion of the language that is stricken-through, and by the addition of the language that is underscored, to read as follows:

Sec. 811-215. Verification of alarm required before notification.

(a) An alarm business which monitors an alarm system located within the city shall not notify the ~~Indianapolis metropolitan police~~ department of public safety that an alarm has been activated, until first attempting to verify the activation by reaching the person having control over the property by telephone, or by other means available to the alarm business. Once the agency has been notified, the alarm business shall immediately attempt to contact any other person who the alarm business knows may be able to verify the activation of the alarm. The alarm business shall immediately notify the agency if it is able to contact such other person. This section does not apply to automatic fire alarm systems, which must comply with Section 811-703.

(b) Failure to comply with the provisions of this section shall constitute a violation of this Code.

SECTION 7. Section 811-311 of the "Revised Code of the Consolidated City and County," regarding false alarms, hereby is amended by the deletion of the language that is stricken-through, and by the addition of the language that is underscored, to read as follows:

Sec. 811-311. False alarms prohibited.

~~(a) It shall be unlawful for a person who owns or controls property in the city on which an alarm system is monitored used to issue, cause to be issued, or permit the issuance of more than one (1) a false alarm in a calendar year. Provided, however, a calculation of the number of false alarms under this section shall not include any false alarm issued within thirty (30) days after the date the alarm system is first monitored.~~

~~(b) A person who owns or controls property on which an alarm system is monitored shall be subject to the following procedures and penalties:~~

- ~~(1) For his or her first false alarm, a person shall receive a written warning from the appropriate law enforcement agency;~~

- (2) ~~For the second, third, and fourth false alarms issued in the same calendar year as a written warning, and for the first, second, third, and fourth false alarms issued in a calendar year subsequent to a year in which a written warning was issued, such person shall be subject to the enforcement procedures provided in Chapter 103, Article III of this Code;~~
- (3) ~~For the fifth false alarm issued in a calendar year, such person shall be subject to the general penalties provided in section 103-3 of this Code; however, the penalty for each such violation shall not be less than one hundred dollars (\$100.00), or thirty dollars (\$30.00) if such person successfully completes an alarm system training course approved by the alarm administrator; and~~
- (4) ~~For the sixth and each subsequent false alarms issued in a calendar year, such person shall be subject to the general penalties provided in section 103-3 of this Code; however, the penalty for each such violation shall not be less than two hundred dollars (\$200.00), and such person shall be ordered to attend an alarm system training course approved by the alarm administrator.~~

SECTION 8. Section 811-312 of the "Revised Code of the Consolidated City and County," regarding externally sounding alarms, hereby is amended by the deletion of the language that is stricken-through, and by the addition of the language that is underscored, to read as follows:

Sec. 811-312. Prolonged externally sounding alarms prohibited.

It shall be unlawful for an alarm system located in the city not to have an automatic reset system which silences the externally sounding alarm within fifteen (15) minutes after activation. For the purposes of this section, alarm system includes systems that, when activated, do not cause notification to be made directly or indirectly to the department of public safety.

SECTION 9. Section 811-313 of the "Revised Code of the Consolidated City and County," regarding automatic notification devices, hereby is amended by the deletion of the language that is stricken-through, and by the addition of the language that is underscored, to read as follows:

Sec. 811-313. Automatic notification devices prohibited.

It shall be unlawful to sell, install, use, or permit the use of any device connected to an alarm system which automatically sends a prerecorded message or coded signal to a law enforcement agency indicating the activation of the alarm system. This section does not apply to automatic fire alarm systems.

SECTION 10. The "Revised Code of the Consolidated City and County" is hereby amended by adding a new Article V, regarding false alarm citations, within Chapter 811 of the Revised Code, to read as follows:

#### **ARTICLE V FALSE ALARM CITATIONS**

##### **Sec. 811-501. Citations issued by the department of code enforcement and by the department of public safety.**

Citations for failing to obtain an alarm business license under Section 811-211 shall be issued by the department of code enforcement or its designee. Citations for violating other provisions of this chapter shall be issued by the department of public safety or its designee.

##### **Sec. 811-502. Penalties for false alarms.**

(a) A person who owns or controls property in the city on which an alarm system is used shall be subject to the following procedures and penalties for a violation of Section 811-311 or 811-704:

- (1) For the first false alarm in a calendar year, the person shall receive a written warning, which shall describe the penalties for continued violations.
- (2) The second, third, fourth, and fifth false alarms in a calendar year are subject to admission of violation and payment of a civil penalty in an amount provided in Section 103-52 of this Code.
- (3) The sixth and each subsequent false alarm in a calendar year is subject to admission of violation and payment of a civil penalty in an amount provided in Section 103-52 of this Code. Alternatively, the violation may be referred to the city prosecutor for prosecution under Section 103-3; however, the penalty for each such violation shall not be less than two hundred dollars (\$200.00).

(b) A calculation of the number of false alarms under this section shall not include any false alarm issued within thirty (30) days after the date the alarm system is first used, nor shall it include any false alarms occurring in any prior calendar years. A calculation of the number of false alarms under this section shall include all false alarms under both Section 811-311 and Section 811-704.

**Sec. 811-503. Review of false alarm citations.**

(a) This section applies only to citations and warnings issued under Section 811-502 and Section 811-704.

(b) The alarm administrator shall adopt a procedure whereby citations and warnings referred to in subsection (a) shall be reviewed through an informal process upon denial of the violation. The person to whom the citation or warning was issued shall be afforded an opportunity to present documentary evidence and written statements concerning the violation, however the person need not be afforded an in-person hearing.

(c) Upon completion of the informal review, the citation or notification shall be either voided or affirmed. The department shall notify the person denying the violation of its decision.

(d) If, upon completion of the informal review, a citation is affirmed, the citation shall be forwarded to the city prosecutor for further enforcement action.

SECTION 11. Section 811-702 of the "Revised Code of the Consolidated City and County," regarding monitoring of fire systems, hereby is amended by the deletion of the language that is stricken-through, and by the addition of the language that is underscored, to read as follows:

Sec. 811-702. Monitoring of fire systems.

Fire alarm systems required by 675 IAC 13, 675 IAC 22 or this chapter shall be monitored as set forth in 675 IAC 13-~~2.3-96~~ and 675 IAC 22-~~2.2-17~~; 1996 edition of N.F.P.A. Standard No. 72, by an approved central, proprietary or remote station service or a local alarm which gives audible and visual signals at a constantly attended location.

SECTION 12. Section 811-704 of the "Revised Code of the Consolidated City and County," regarding faulty fire alarms, hereby is amended by the deletion of the language that is stricken-through, and by the addition of the language that is underscored, to read as follows:

Sec. 811-704. Faulty alarms.

~~(a) It shall be unlawful for a person who owns or controls property in the city on which a manual or automatic fire alarm system is monitored used to issue, cause to be issued, or permit the issuance of an automatic fire alarm or medical alarm at a premise or building more than one (1) time in a twelve month period:~~

- ~~(1) Due to improper alarm installation, lack of maintenance, servicing, inadvertent activation, or failure to notify the fire department of a drill or test; and~~
- ~~(2) Resulting in the deployment of fire department apparatus and personnel to the property.~~

~~Provided, however, a calculation of the number of faulty alarms under this section shall not include any faulty alarm issued within thirty (30) days after the date the alarm system is first monitored.~~

~~(b) A person who owns or controls property on which an alarm system is monitored shall be subject to the following procedures and penalties for a faulty alarm under this section:~~

- ~~(1) For the first response in a twelve month period, the person shall receive a written warning from the servicing fire department;~~
- ~~(2) For the second, third, and fourth responses in a twelve month period, the person shall be subject to the enforcement procedures provided in chapter 103, article III of this Code;~~
- ~~(3) For a fifth response in a twelve month period, the person shall be subject to the general penalties provided in section 103.3 of this Code; however, the penalty for each such violation shall not be less than one hundred dollars (\$100.00); and~~

- (4) ~~For sixth and subsequent responses in a twelve-month period, the person shall be subject to the general penalties provided in section 103-3 of this Code; however, the penalty for each such violations shall not be less than two hundred dollars (\$200.00).~~

SECTION 13. Section 103-52 of the "Revised Code of the Consolidated City and County," regarding civil penalties for ordinance violations, hereby is amended by the deletion of the language that is stricken-through, and by the addition of the language that is underscored, to read as follows:

Sec. 103-52. Schedule of Code provisions and penalties.

The following Code (or ordinance) provisions and their respective civil penalties are designated for enforcement through the ordinance violations bureau:

Code Section	Subject Matter	Civil Penalty
293-321	Failure to file economic statement of interest—First offense	50.00
321-1	Swimming in unguarded waters—First offense in calendar year	50.00
361-108	Littering on premises of another	45.00
361-201	Vehicle losing its load—First offense in calendar year	50.00
391-302	Unlawful noise—First offense in calendar year	50.00
407-103	Loitering—First offense in calendar year	50.00
407-201	Unlawful fireworks use, ignition or discharge—First offense	100.00
431-108	Parking prohibited for street repairs and cleaning	20.00
431-314	Premises address violation—Second offense in calendar year	25.00
431-602	Bicycles—Second violation in a twelve-month period regarding children under twelve	50.00
431-603	Unlawful operation of bicycle—First violation in a twelve-month period	50.00
431-604	Unattended bicycle or bicycle not in operation—First violation in a twelve-month period	50.00
431-604	Unattended bicycle or bicycle not in operation—Second violation in a twelve-month period	100.00
431-604	Unattended bicycle or bicycle not in operation—Third violation in a twelve-month period	200.00
431-702	Prohibited activity in roadways—First violation in twelve-month period	25.00
431-703	Interference with vehicular traffic—First violation in twelve-month period	25.00
441-108	Pedestrian violations	12.50
441-214	Parking when temporarily prohibited	20.00
441-318	Unlawful use of horn or sounding device	15.00
441-374	Bicycle path or lane—First violation in a twelve-month period	50.00
441-363	Unlawfully parked trailer	20.00
441-407	Display of unauthorized traffic controls	15.00
441-408	Interference with traffic control devices	15.00
441-503	Consumption or possession by operator of motor vehicle—First offense in calendar year	50.00
441-504	Operating motor vehicle containing open alcoholic beverages—First offense in calendar year	50.00

511-702	Open burning	50.00
531-102	Animal at large—First offense in twelve-month period	50.00
531-202	No dog or cat permanent identification—First offense	50.00
531-202	No dog or cat permanent identification—Second and subsequent offenses	100.00
531-301	No dog or cat antirabies vaccination—First offense	100.00
531-302	No antirabies vaccination tag on dog or cat—First offense in twelve-month period	25.00
531-302	No antirabies vaccination record for feral cat colony—First offense in twelve-month period	25.00
575-206	Violation of graffiti ordinance	50.00
611-403	Unlawful loading or unloading of private bus	15.00
611-501	Unlawful stopping of food vendor vehicle	15.00
611-502	Violation of noise restriction on food vendors	15.00
611-504	Failure of food vending vehicle to display required warnings	15.00
611-506	Unlawful vending from other than curbside of vending vehicle	15.00
616-402	Violation of restrictions on smoking in certain areas	100.00
621-106	Unlawful parking on sidewalk, in crosswalk, or adjacent yard	25.00
621-107	Unlawful parking in certain school areas	20.00
621-108	Unlawful manner of parking	20.00
621-109	No required lights on certain parked vehicles	20.00
621-110	Violation of handicapped parking restrictions	100.00
621-111	Unlawful parking in handicapped parking meter zone	100.00
621-112	Unloading perpendicular to curb without permit	20.00
621-113	Unlawful use of bus stops and taxicab stands	20.00
621-114	Unlawful use of passenger and loading zones	20.00
621-115	Unlawful parking adjacent to certain buildings	20.00
621-116	Unlawful parking for display for sale or advertising	20.00
621-117	Unlawful parking for more than six (6) hours	20.00
621-118	Unlawful parking of commercial vehicles at night	20.00
621-119	Unlawful parking in alleys or on certain narrow streets	20.00
621-120	Unlawful parking in designated special parking areas	20.00
621-121	Parking on certain streets where prohibited at all times	20.00
621-122	Stopping, standing or parking on streets where prohibited at all times	20.00
621-123	Parking on certain streets where prohibited at all times on certain days	20.00
621-124	Parking on certain streets when prohibited at certain times on certain days	20.00
621-125	Stopping, standing or parking during prohibited hours on certain days on certain streets	25.00
621-126	Parking longer than permitted on certain streets at certain times on certain days	20.00
621-127	Unlawful outdoor storage of inoperable motor vehicle—First offense in a twelve-month period	50.00
621-127	Unlawful outdoor storage of inoperable motor vehicle—Second offense in a twelve-month period	250.00



621-128	First violation in twelve-month period	50.00
621-128	Second violation in twelve-month period	100.00
621-221	Parking in parking meter space when prohibited	20.00
621-226	Parking in excess of maximum time permitted in parking meter space	20.00
621-227	Expired parking meter	20.00
621-306	Unlawful parking during snow emergency	25.00
621-404	Leaving taxicab unattended	20.00
621-405	Unlawful parking in certain mailbox zones	20.00
621-430(a)	Unlawful use of loading zone in Regional Center by non-eligible vehicle	25.00
621-430(b)	Unlawful use of loading zone in Regional Center—Non-permitted use	25.00
621-430(c)	Unlawful use of loading zone in Regional Center in excess of posted time limits	25.00
621-430(d)	Unlawful obstructing traffic in the Regional Center	25.00
621-430(e)	Unlawful parking in alleys or on certain narrow streets in the Regional Center	25.00
621-501	Unlawful stopping, standing or parking near fire hydrant	75.00
621-502	Unlawful obstruction of fire lane	75.00
631-102	In park after hours—First offense in calendar year	50.00
631-109	Alcohol in park—First offense in calendar year	50.00
645-528	Skateboard or similar play device—First offense in calendar year	50.00
706-105	Water conservation violation—First offense in twelve-month period	100.00
706-105	Water conservation violation—Second offense in twelve-month period	250.00
730-505	Civil zoning violations—First offense in calendar year	50.00
811-214	Alarm business failure to report monitoring information	100.00
<del>811-311</del>	<del>First false alarm in calendar year after a year in which a warning was issued</del>	<del>25.00</del>
<del>811-311</del> <u>502</u>	<del>Second false alarm in same calendar year as warning</del>	50.00
<del>811-311</del>	<del>Second false alarm in all other calendar years</del>	<del>50.00</del>
<del>811-311</del> <u>502</u>	<del>Third false alarm in same calendar year as warning</del>	75.00
<del>811-311</del>	<del>Third false alarm in all other calendar years</del>	<del>75.00</del>
<del>811-311</del> <u>502</u>	<del>Fourth false alarm in same calendar year as warning</del>	100.00
<del>811-311</del>	<del>Fourth false alarm in all other calendar years</del>	<del>100.00</del>
<u>811-502</u>	<u>Fifth false alarm in calendar year</u>	<u>125.00</u>
<u>811-502</u>	<u>Sixth and subsequent false alarms in calendar year</u>	<u>200.00</u>
<del>811-704</del>	<del>Second faulty fire alarm in twelve month period</del>	<del>25.00</del>
<del>811-704</del>	<del>Third faulty fire alarm in twelve month period</del>	<del>50.00</del>
<del>811-704</del>	<del>Fourth faulty fire alarm in twelve month period</del>	<del>75.00</del>
875-702	Construction activity without required license, listing or registration—First offense in twelve-month period	250.00
Ch. 895	Horse-drawn carriage violation—First offense in twelve-month period	100.00
Ch. 903	Pedal cab violation—First offense in twelve-month period	100.00
931-305	Excessive parking charge at commercial parking facility—First offense in twelve-month period	100.00

996-77	No monthly taxicab certificate—First offense in twelve-month period	25.00
996-123	Failure to maintain public vehicle for hire—First offense in twelve-month period	25.00
996-124	Taxicab operator dress code violation—First offense in twelve-month period	25.00
996-126	Failure to display licenses or fare schedule—First offense in twelve-month period	25.00
996-138	Taxicab operator exceeding limitation on hours—First offense in twelve-month period	25.00

SECTION 14. The expressed or implied repeal or amendment by this ordinance of any other ordinance or part of any other ordinance does not affect any rights or liabilities accrued, penalties incurred, or proceedings begun prior to the effective date of this ordinance. Those rights, liabilities, and proceedings are continued, and penalties shall be imposed and enforced under the repealed or amended ordinance as if this ordinance had not been adopted.

SECTION 15. Should any provision (section, paragraph, sentence, clause, or any other portion) of this ordinance be declared by a court of competent jurisdiction to be invalid for any reason, the remaining provision or provisions shall not be affected, if and only if such remaining provisions can, without the invalid provision or provisions, be given the effect intended by the Council in adopting this ordinance. To this end the provisions of this ordinance are severable.

SECTION 16. This ordinance shall be in effect from and after its passage by the Council and compliance with Ind. Code § 36-3-4-14 or January 1, 2015, whichever later occurs.

PROPOSAL NO. 5, 2014. Councillor Brown reported that the Public Works Committee heard Proposal No. 5, 2014 on April 3, 2014. The proposal, sponsored by Councillor Simpson, authorizes intersection controls on Ruckle Street, Park Avenue, and Broadway Street from 19th to 21st Streets as a calming measure for King Park (District 9). By a 7-0 vote, the Committee reported the proposal to the Council with the recommendation that it do pass. Councillor Brown moved, seconded by Councillor Adamson, for adoption. Proposal No. 5, 2014 was adopted on the following roll call vote; viz:

29 YEAS: Adamson, Barth, Brown, Cain, Evans, Freeman, Gooden, Gray, Hickman, Holliday, Hunter, Lewis, Lutz, Mahern, Mansfield, Mascari, McHenry, McQuillen, Miller, Moriarty, Adams, Oliver, Osili, Pfisterer, Robinson, Sandlin, Scales, Shreve, Simpson  
0 NAYS:

Proposal No. 5, 2014 was retitled GENERAL ORDINANCE NO. 5, 2014, and reads as follows:

CITY-COUNTY GENERAL ORDINANCE NO. 5, 2014

A GENERAL ORDINANCE amending the “Revised Code of the Consolidated City and County,” Sec. 441-416, Schedule of intersection controls.

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY-COUNTY COUNCIL OF THE  
CITY OF INDIANAPOLIS AND OF MARION COUNTY, INDIANA:

SECTION 1. The “Revised Code of the Consolidated City and County,” specifically, Sec. 441-416, Schedule of intersection controls, be and the same is hereby amended by the deletion of the following, to wit:

<u>BASE MAP</u>	<u>INTERSECTION</u>	<u>PREFERENTIAL</u>	<u>TYPE OF CONTROL</u>
25	21 <sup>st</sup> St Broadway St	21 <sup>st</sup> St	Stop
25	20 <sup>th</sup> St Ruckle St	20 <sup>th</sup> St	Stop
25	20 <sup>th</sup> St Park Ave	Park Ave	Stop

25	19 <sup>th</sup> St Broadway St	Broadway St	Stop
----	------------------------------------	-------------	------

SECTION 2. The "Revised Code of the Consolidated City and County," specifically, Sec. 441-416, Schedule of intersection controls, be and the same is hereby amended by the addition of the following, to wit:

<u>BASE MAP</u>	<u>INTERSECTION</u>	<u>PREFERENTIAL</u>	<u>TYPE OF CONTROL</u>
25	21 <sup>st</sup> St Broadway St	None	All-Way Stop
25	20 <sup>th</sup> St Ruckle St	None	All-Way Stop
25	20 <sup>th</sup> St Park Ave	None	All-Way Stop
25	19 <sup>th</sup> St Broadway St	None	All-Way Stop

SECTION 3. This ordinance shall be in full force and effect upon adoption and compliance with IC 36-3-4-14.

PROPOSAL NO. 6, 2014. Councillor Barth reported that the Rules and Public Policy Committee heard Proposal No. 6, 2014 on February 18 and March 18, 2014. The proposal, sponsored by Councillors Mansfield and Scales, amends Chapter 451 of the Code, concerning weapons, and adds new sections restricting the use and discharge of weapons in the Consolidated City. By a 4-2 vote, the Committee reported the proposal to the Council with the recommendation that it do pass. Councillor Barth moved, seconded by Councillor Oliver, for adoption.

Councillor Mansfield said that the current ordinance prohibits dangerous weapons throughout the whole city, but this allows that some places are safe where no danger is caused to residents, such as at the conservation club and areas where hunting is still permissible. She said that it is not acceptable to have duck hunting north of the City limits in her area, and she had had numerous complaints in 2007, when she first offered a similar proposal. People should have the right to live in peace on their own property. She asked Mr. Biesecker to speak to why they have the legal authority to do this. Mr. Biesecker said that OCC's position on this matter is plausible, but he does not think it is persuasive. He said that he provided a summary of his opinion in March. The issue came before the Council in 2011 in response to the passage of a State law, and at that time, the Council passed an ordinance to repeal portions of the Code that regulated the possession of firearms. However, they did not repeal the Code sections addressed by this proposal and the discharge of firearms. State law prohibits local governments regulating the possession of firearms, but not the discharge. Otherwise, they would have repealed the discharge ordinances in 2011, as well. The statute has not changed, but the interpretation has. He said that he covered other reasons in his memo that was distributed. Many other cities have firearm discharge ordinances still on the books, despite the new State law, including Fort Wayne and Beech Grove. If OCC is correct, these have all been void since July 1, 2011, yet they are all still on the books. He said that the ordinance itself applies to the entire County because of a change in the police special service district definition. This creates an exception to bans that are not there now, and opens up more opportunities for discharge than is currently allowed. He said that the issue was brought up that the City could be liable for damages, but in a City of Hammond suit, the ordinance was considered void since the State statute was in effect, and they ruled in favor of Hammond.

Councillor Freeman said that his district has a lot of land with adequate deer hunting. He added that this ordinance is a bad one, with unintended consequences. He said that this can saddle an

individual with a D felony and criminal recklessness with this 100 feet provision. He said that to say the entire County has to live under this does not make sense.

Councillor Scales said that it will not matter to the parents of a child killed by a stray bullet whether it was criminal or someone hunting. This activity is putting citizens at risk and it is a public safety issue. It does not need a lot of tax dollars to address it, and it is reasonable, while also recognizing that Marion County has developed into a highly populated area. However, it still recognizes undeveloped properties of 10 acres or more, where target shooting and hunting are still allowed. She said that residents in certain parts of Marion County already enjoy this protection, and there is no good reason why some should be protected and others not. She said that she has worked for years with the Department of Natural Resources and duck hunters to find a resolution to this problem. People need to expect safety in their own homes and not feel that they are hostages in their own homes. It becomes a quality of life issue when someone has to hear gunshots from 6:45 a.m. to dusk. She asked Councillor Freeman to put himself in these residents' shoes, because he would not want to hear gunshots not knowing if it is criminal activity or hunting.

Councillor Hickman said that she lives near the area Councillor Scales is talking about, and considering the high velocity of some guns out there, 10 acres really is not much. When neighbors are pulling bullets out of their walls, it is not predictable how far bullets will go. She said that she believes it should be more like 15 or 20 acres, but a reasonable and safe distance is needed.

Councillor Gooden said that he is not in support of this proposal, and it is not directly about the concerns of the discharge of firearms. He understands the concerns, but he is concerned that it does not comport with the revisions to the Code as it stands now, and may already be void and against the law. He said that the Code prohibits any political subdivision from regulating firearms and firearm accessories, and states that any ordinance acted on after June 30, 2011 is void. He added that the violation penalty language in Section 5 concerns him that anyone aggrieved by the ordinance could have a cause of action, with an opportunity for unlimited cause for actions. He said that he believes they are exposing themselves to extreme liabilities, consequences and costs with this language. He said that there are already criminal recklessness statutes which are far more significant, and he believes there are other properties, such as along the White River that would be governed by DNR, who has the authority to regulate hunting on navigated waterways. He said that with modest enforcement ability and the enforcement and fee structure, he cannot vote in support of this proposal.

Councillor Mansfield said that the State's legislation originally had the wording for "discharge" but they deleted it before passing. DNR has taken the position that when a waterway is within City limits, local laws apply. She said that they have passed ordinances about the discharge of fireworks to improve the quality of life, yet she does not understand why the discharge of dangerous weapons does not deserve the same consideration. She urged her colleagues to reconsider and support the proposal.

Councillor Miller asked what the director of the Department of Public Safety (DPS) has to say about this ordinance and if he's been consulted, as it would seem it would directly impact DPS.

Councillor Scales said that because of the ambiguity of the law, she believes there is a lack of understanding. She moved, seconded by Councillor Mansfield, to postpone Proposal No. 6, 2014 to receive input from Director Troy Riggs, DPS, and to clarify some legal issues.

Councillor Freeman said that taking time to figure things out and read a report and get additional information before voting is a novel idea.

Councillor Mahern said that this does not affect his district, but some areas are still rural and he respects those who hunt. However, he does not know if 10 acres is enough, even though it is more than a mile. He encouraged the parties to work together to address the concerns while still respecting the rights of those who still hunt.

The motion to postpone Proposal No. 6, 2014 failed on the following roll call vote; viz:

*14 YEAS: Adamson, Barth, Gray, Hickman, Lewis, Mahern, Mansfield, Mascari, Oliver, Osili, Scales, Shreve, Simpson, Talley*

*15 NAYS: Brown, Cain, Evans, Freeman, Gooden, Holliday, Hunter, Lutz, McHenry, McQuillen, Miller, Moriarty Adams, Pfisterer, Robinson, Sandlin*

Councillor Freeman moved, seconded by Councillor McQuillen, to end debate and call for the question. The motion carried on the following roll call vote; viz:

*17 YEAS: Cain, Evans, Freeman, Gooden, Gray, Hickman, Hunter, Lewis, Mascari, McQuillen, Miller, Moriarty Adams, Osili, Pfisterer, Robinson, Simpson, Talley*

*12 NAYS: Adamson, Barth, Brown, Holliday, Lutz, Mahern, Mansfield, McHenry, Oliver, Sandlin, Scales, Shreve*

Proposal No. 6, 2014 failed on the following roll call vote; viz:

*13 YEAS: Adamson, Barth, Brown, Gray, Hickman, Lewis, Mansfield, Oliver, Osili, Robinson, Scales, Simpson, Talley*

*16 NAYS: Cain, Evans, Freeman, Gooden, Holliday, Hunter, Lutz, Mahern, Mascari, McHenry, McQuillen, Miller, Moriarty Adams, Pfisterer, Sandlin, Shreve*

*0 NOT VOTING:*

*0 ABSENT:*

Councillors Holliday, Scales, Mahern, Hunter, and Oliver asked for consent to explain their votes. Consent was given.

Councillor Holliday stated that some residents had asked him to support and others to oppose this proposal. However, given the legalities and unanswered questions, he felt it was too great a risk to support. Councillor Scales said that she finds it confounding that they would move ahead with the panhandling vote that the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) vowed to sue over, yet would not move forward with something that would insure the safety of citizens. Councillor Mahern said that he could have supported the measure if it had been crafted better and they had received more information. He said that he would have rather seen it postponed to find a compromise to fit all parts of a very diverse City. Councillor Hunter said that the penalty would be high if they got this wrong, and it is an affront to home rule, but the remedy holds the City accountable. Councillor Oliver said that it is not about who owns guns, but about citizens feeling safe, and he is saddened that this did not pass.

PROPOSAL NO. 21, 2014. Councillor Brown reported that the Public Works Committee heard Proposal No. 21, 2014 on April 3, 2014. The proposal, sponsored by Councillor Miller, approves intersection controls at Warman Avenue and CSX Railroad Crossing (District 19). By a 7-0 vote, the Committee reported the proposal to the Council with the recommendation that it do pass.

Councillor Miller thanked the Department of Public Works for this stopsign, as it will make a big difference in an area that recently reported an accident with \$50,000 in damage at this intersection.

Councillor Brown moved, seconded by Councillor Adamson, for adoption. Proposal No. 21, 2014 was adopted on the following roll call vote; viz:

*29 YEAS: Adamson, Barth, Brown, Cain, Evans, Freeman, Gooden, Gray, Hickman, Holliday, Hunter, Lewis, Lutz, Mahern, Mansfield, Mascari, McHenry, McQuillen, Miller, Moriarty Adams, Oliver, Osili, Pfisterer, Robinson, Sandlin, Scales, Shreve, Simpson*  
*0 NAYS:*

Proposal No. 21, 2014 was retitled GENERAL ORDINANCE NO. 6, 2014, and reads as follows:

CITY-COUNTY GENERAL ORDINANCE NO. 6, 2014

A GENERAL ORDINANCE amending the "Revised Code of the Consolidated City and County," Sec. 441-416, Schedule of intersection controls.

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY-COUNTY COUNCIL OF THE  
CITY OF INDIANAPOLIS AND OF MARION COUNTY, INDIANA:

SECTION 1. The "Revised Code of the Consolidated City and County," specifically, Sec. 441-416, Schedule of intersection controls, be and the same is hereby amended by the addition of the following, to wit:

<u>BASE MAP</u>	<u>INTERSECTION</u>	<u>PREFERENTIAL</u>	<u>TYPE OF CONTROL</u>
24	Warman Av CSX Railroad Crossing #539176D	CSX Railroad Crossing #539176D	Stop

SECTION 2. This ordinance shall be in full force and effect upon adoption and compliance with IC 36-3-4-14.

PROPOSAL NO. 56, 2014. Councillor Barth reported that the Rules and Public Policy Committee heard Proposal No. 56, 2014 on March 18, 2014. The proposal, sponsored by Councillors Pfisterer, Lutz and Lewis, amends the Code to change the boundaries of the consolidated city and police special service district to reflect the recent disannexation of territory to the Town of Speedway. By a 4-0-1 vote, the Committee reported the proposal to the Council with the recommendation that it do pass.

Councillor Lutz asked for consent to abstain, as his law office represents the Town of Speedway. Consent was given.

Councillor Barth moved, seconded by Councillor Mansfield adoption. Proposal No. 56, 2014 was adopted on the following roll call vote; viz:

*28 YEAS: Adamson, Barth, Brown, Cain, Evans, Freeman, Gooden, Gray, Hickman, Holliday, Hunter, Lewis, Mahern, Mansfield, Mascari, McHenry, McQuillen, Miller, Moriarty Adams, Oliver, Osili, Pfisterer, Robinson, Sandlin, Scales, Shreve, Simpson, Talley*  
*0 NAYS:*  
*1 NOT VOTING: Lutz*

Proposal No. 56, 2014 was retitled GENERAL ORDINANCE NO. 7, 2014, and reads as follows:

CITY-COUNTY GENERAL ORDINANCE NO. 7, 2014

PROPOSAL FOR A GENERAL ORDINANCE amending Sec. 111-1 of the Code to change the boundaries of the consolidated city and police special service district to reflect the recent disannexation of territory to the Town of Speedway.

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY-COUNTY COUNCIL OF THE  
CITY OF INDIANAPOLIS AND OF MARION COUNTY, INDIANA:

SECTION 1. The "Revised Code of the Consolidated City and County," specifically, Sec. 111-1, is hereby amended to add a new subsection (9) to read as follows:

(9) Disannexation to Town of Speedway. The following territory is transferred to the Town of Speedway:

Part of the Southeast Quarter of Section 26, Township 16 North, Range 2 East, in Marion County, Indiana, being more particularly described as follows:

Commencing at the Northeast corner of the Southeast Quarter of Section 26, Township 16 North, Range 2 East; thence South 00 degrees 55 minutes 17 seconds West 244.73 feet along the East Line of said Southeast Quarter to the boundary line of a tract of land granted to Carl W. Ritchie as Instrument #83-14860 in the Office of the Recorder of Marion County Indiana, said point being the POINT OF BEGINNING of this description; thence continue along said East Line South 00 degrees 55 minutes 17 seconds West 1519.04 feet to the southern line of a tract of land granted to Crawfordsville Road Partners, LLC as Instrument #2007-0093287 in said Office of the Recorder; the next nine (9) courses are along southern, western and northern boundary lines of said Crawfordsville Road Partners Tract; (1) thence North 43 degrees 15 minutes 34 seconds West 216.46 feet; (2) thence North 16 degrees 15 minutes 06 seconds West 508.90 feet; (3) North 62 degrees 57 minutes 35 seconds West 453.66 feet; (4) thence North 75 degrees 37 minutes 31 seconds West 494.10 feet; (5) North 81 degrees 32 minutes 51 seconds West 137.94 feet to a curve concave easterly having a radius of 6982.09 feet; (6) thence along said curve 267.36 feet, said curve being subtended by a long chord having a bearing of North 00 degrees 41 minutes 47 seconds West and a length of 267.34 feet; (7) thence North 00 degrees 24 minutes 02 seconds East 86.79 feet; (8) thence South 89 degrees 35 minutes 58 seconds East 251.82 feet to a curve concave northerly having a radius of 1049.93 feet; (9) thence along said curve 524.27 feet, said curve being subtended by a long chord having a bearing of North 88 degrees 57 minutes 35 seconds East and a length of 518.84 feet to a curve concave Northerly having a radius of 1049.93 feet; thence along said curve and the westerly line of a tract of land granted to Carl W. Ritchie as Instrument #80-84520 in said Office of the Recorder 299.53 feet, said curve being subtended by a long chord having a bearing of North 65 degrees 30 minutes 44 seconds East and a length of 298.52 feet to a curve concave northwesterly having a radius of 1049.93 feet; thence along said curve and a western boundary line of a tract of land granted to Carl W. Ritchie as Instrument #83-14860 in said office of the Recorder 70.77 feet; said curve being subtended by a long chord having a bearing of North 56 degrees 28 minutes 25 seconds East and a length of 70.75 feet; the next four (4) courses are along the western and northern boundary lines of said Instrument #83-14860; (1) thence North 74 degrees 46 minutes 41 seconds East 40.00 feet; (2) thence South 71 degrees 57 minutes 43 seconds East 106.47 feet; (3) thence North 18 degrees 02 minutes 17 seconds East 50.00 feet; (4) thence South 71 degrees 57 minutes 43 seconds East 84.60 feet to the Point of Beginning, containing 20.568 acres more or less.

SECTION 2. This ordinance shall be in full force and effect upon adoption and compliance with IC 36-3-4-14.

Councillor Brown reported that the Public Works Committee heard Proposal Nos. 82-89, 2014 on April 3, 2014. He asked for consent to vote on these proposals together. Consent was given.

PROPOSAL NO. 82, 2014. The proposal, sponsored by Councillor Simpson, authorizes parking restrictions on Broadway Street at 42nd Street (District 9). PROPOSAL NO. 83, 2014. The proposal, sponsored by Councillor Freeman, authorizes intersection controls in the Bunker Hill Subdivision (District 25). PROPOSAL NO. 84, 2014. The proposal, sponsored by Councillor Miller, authorizes parking restrictions on Fletcher Avenue between East Street and College Avenue (District 19). PROPOSAL NO. 85, 2014. The proposal, sponsored by Councillor Osili, authorizes parking restrictions on Indiana Avenue from North Street to Blake Street (District 15). PROPOSAL NO. 86, 2014. The proposal, sponsored by Councillor Osili, authorizes parking restrictions on Milburn Street and Montcalm Street (District 15). PROPOSAL NO. 87, 2014.

The proposal, sponsored by Councillor Talley, authorizes intersection controls at Shadeland Station and Shadeland Station Way (District 11). PROPOSAL NO. 88, 2014. The proposal, sponsored by Councillor Hunter, authorizes intersection controls on Clifford Drive and Chesterhill Lane (District 21). PROPOSAL NO. 89, 2014. The proposal, sponsored by Councillor Gooden, authorizes intersection controls at Broadway Street and Laverock Road (District 3). By 7-0 votes, the Committee reported the proposals to the Council with the recommendation that they do pass. Councillor Brown moved, seconded by Councillor Talley, for adoption. Proposal Nos. 82-89, 2014 were adopted on the following roll call vote; viz:

29 YEAS: Adamson, Barth, Brown, Cain, Evans, Freeman, Gooden, Gray, Hickman, Holliday, Hunter, Lewis, Lutz, Mahern, Mansfield, Mascari, McHenry, McQuillen, Miller, Moriarty, Adams, Oliver, Osili, Pfisterer, Robinson, Sandlin, Scales, Shreve, Simpson  
0 NAYS:

Proposal No. 82, 2014 was retitled GENERAL ORDINANCE NO. 8, 2014, and reads as follows:

CITY-COUNTY GENERAL ORDINANCE NO. 8, 2014

A GENERAL ORDINANCE amending the "Revised Code of the Consolidated City and County," Sec. 621-122, Stopping, standing or parking prohibited at all times on certain designated streets.

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY-COUNTY COUNCIL OF THE  
CITY OF INDIANAPOLIS AND OF MARION COUNTY, INDIANA:

SECTION 1. The "Revised Code of the Consolidated City and County," specifically, Sec. 621-122, Stopping, standing or parking prohibited at all times on certain designated streets, be and the same is hereby amended by the addition of the following, to wit:

*Broadway Street*, on the east side, from a point 155 feet south of 42<sup>nd</sup> Street to 42<sup>nd</sup> Street.

SECTION 2. This ordinance shall be in full force and effect upon adoption and compliance with IC 36-3-4-14.

Proposal No. 83, 2014 was retitled GENERAL ORDINANCE NO. 9, 2014, and reads as follows:

CITY-COUNTY GENERAL ORDINANCE NO. 9, 2014

A GENERAL ORDINANCE amending the "Revised Code of the Consolidated City and County," Sec. 441-416, Schedule of intersection controls.

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY-COUNTY COUNCIL OF THE  
CITY OF INDIANAPOLIS AND OF MARION COUNTY, INDIANA:

SECTION 1. The "Revised Code of the Consolidated City and County," specifically, Sec. 441-416, Schedule of intersection controls, be and the same is hereby amended by the deletion of the following, to wit:

<u>BASE MAP</u>	<u>INTERSECTION</u>	<u>PREFERENTIAL</u>	<u>TYPE OF CONTROL</u>
48	Stearns Hill Dr Woodford Ln	Stearns Hill Dr	Stop
48	Breeds Hill Dr Woodford Ln	Breeds Hill Dr	Stop

SECTION 2. The "Revised Code of the Consolidated City and County," specifically, Sec. 441-416, Schedule of intersection controls, be and the same is hereby amended by the addition of the following, to wit:

<u>BASE MAP</u>	<u>INTERSECTION</u>	<u>PREFERENTIAL</u>	<u>TYPE OF CONTROL</u>
48	Stearns Hill Dr Woodford Ln	None	All-Way Stop



April 14, 2014

48	Breeds Hill Dr Woodford Ln	None	All-Way Stop
48	Breeds Hill Ct Breeds Hill Dr	Breeds Hill Dr	Stop
48	Stearns Hill Ct Stearns Hill Dr	Stearns Hill Dr	Stop
48	Donington Cir Kentland Dr	Kentland Dr	Stop

SECTION 3. This ordinance shall be in full force and effect upon adoption and compliance with IC 36-3-4-14.

Proposal No. 84, 2014 was retitled GENERAL ORDINANCE NO. 10, 2014, and reads as follows:

CITY-COUNTY GENERAL ORDINANCE NO. 10, 2014

A GENERAL ORDINANCE amending the "Revised Code of the Consolidated City and County," Sec. 621-125, Stopping, standing and parking prohibited at designated locations on certain days and hours.

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY-COUNTY COUNCIL OF THE  
CITY OF INDIANAPOLIS AND OF MARION COUNTY, INDIANA:

SECTION 1. The "Revised Code of the Consolidated City and County," specifically, Sec. 621-125, Stopping, standing and parking prohibited at designated locations on certain days and hours, be and the same is hereby amended by the deletion of the following, to wit:

ON ANY DAY EXCEPT SATURDAY  
AND SUNDAY

*From 6:00 a.m. to 9:00 a.m. and  
from 3:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m.*

*Fletcher Avenue, on the north side, from East Street to College Avenue;*

SECTION 2. The "Revised Code of the Consolidated City and County," specifically, Sec. 621-125, Stopping, standing and parking prohibited at designated locations on certain days and hours, be and the same is hereby amended by the addition of the following, to wit:

ON ANY DAY EXCEPT SATURDAY  
AND SUNDAY

*From 6:00 a.m. to 9:00 a.m.*

*Fletcher Avenue, on the north side, from East Street to College Avenue;*

SECTION 3. This ordinance shall be in full force and effect upon adoption and compliance with IC 36-3-4-14.

Proposal No. 85, 2014 was retitled GENERAL ORDINANCE NO. 11, 2014, and reads as follows:

CITY-COUNTY GENERAL ORDINANCE NO. 11, 2014

A GENERAL ORDINANCE amending the "Revised Code of the Consolidated City and County," Sec. 621-125, Stopping, standing and parking prohibited at designated locations on certain days and hours.

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY-COUNTY COUNCIL OF THE  
CITY OF INDIANAPOLIS AND OF MARION COUNTY, INDIANA:

SECTION 1. The "Revised Code of the Consolidated City and County," specifically, Sec. 621-125, Stopping, standing and parking prohibited at designated locations on certain days and hours, be and the same is hereby amended by the deletion of the following, to wit:

ON ANY DAY EXCEPT SATURDAY  
AND SUNDAY

*From 4:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m.*

*Indiana Avenue, on the northeast side, from North Street to Blake Street;*

SECTION 2. This ordinance shall be in full force and effect upon adoption and compliance with IC 36-3-4-14.

Proposal No. 86, 2014 was retitled GENERAL ORDINANCE NO. 12, 2014, and reads as follows:

CITY-COUNTY GENERAL ORDINANCE NO. 12, 2014

A GENERAL ORDINANCE amending the "Revised Code of the Consolidated City and County," Sec. 621-121, Parking prohibited at all times on certain streets.

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY-COUNTY COUNCIL OF THE  
CITY OF INDIANAPOLIS AND OF MARION COUNTY, INDIANA:

SECTION 1. The "Revised Code of the Consolidated City and County," specifically, Sec. 621-121, Parking prohibited at all times on certain streets, be and the same is hereby amended by the deletion of the following, to wit:

*Milburn Street, on the east side, from a point Sixteenth Street to Indiana Avenue;*

*Montcalm Street, on the west side, from Stadium Drive to Fourteenth Street;*

SECTION 2. That the Revised Code of the Consolidated City and County, Indianapolis/Marion County, Indiana, specifically Sec. 621-121, Parking prohibited at all times on certain streets, be, and the same is hereby amended by the addition of the following, to wit:

*Milburn Street, on the east side, from Sixteenth Street to Fourteenth Street;*

*Milburn Street, on the west side, from Indiana Avenue to a point 150 feet north of Indiana Avenue*

SECTION 3. This ordinance shall be in full force and effect upon adoption and compliance with IC 36-3-4-14.

Proposal No. 87, 2014 was retitled GENERAL ORDINANCE NO. 13, 2014, and reads as follows:

CITY-COUNTY GENERAL ORDINANCE NO. 13, 2014

A GENERAL ORDINANCE amending the "Revised Code of the Consolidated City and County," Sec. 441-416, Schedule of intersection controls.

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY-COUNTY COUNCIL OF THE  
CITY OF INDIANAPOLIS AND OF MARION COUNTY, INDIANA:

SECTION 1. The "Revised Code of the Consolidated City and County," specifically, Sec. 441-416, Schedule of intersection controls, be and the same is hereby amended by the deletion of the following, to wit:

BASE MAP  
13

INTERSECTION  
Shadeland Station  
Shadeland Station Way

PREFERENTIAL  
Shadeland Station

TYPE OF CONTROL  
Stop

April 14, 2014

SECTION 2. The "Revised Code of the Consolidated City and County," specifically, Sec. 441-416, Schedule of intersection controls, be and the same is hereby amended by the addition of the following, to wit:

<u>BASE MAP</u>	<u>INTERSECTION</u>	<u>PREFERENTIAL</u>	<u>TYPE OF CONTROL</u>
13	Shadeland Station Shadeland Station Way	None	All-Way Stop

SECTION 3. This ordinance shall be in full force and effect upon adoption and compliance with IC 36-3-4-14.

Proposal No. 88, 2014 was retitled GENERAL ORDINANCE NO. 14, 2014, and reads as follows:

CITY-COUNTY GENERAL ORDINANCE NO. 14, 2014

A GENERAL ORDINANCE amending the "Revised Code of the Consolidated City and County," Sec. 441-416, Schedule of intersection controls.

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY-COUNTY COUNCIL OF THE  
CITY OF INDIANAPOLIS AND OF MARION COUNTY, INDIANA:

SECTION 1. The "Revised Code of the Consolidated City and County," specifically, Sec. 441-416, Schedule of intersection controls, be and the same is hereby amended by the deletion of the following, to wit:

<u>BASE MAP</u>	<u>INTERSECTION</u>	<u>PREFERENTIAL</u>	<u>TYPE OF CONTROL</u>
34	Chesterhill Ln St. Clifford Dr	St. Clifford Dr	Stop

SECTION 2. The "Revised Code of the Consolidated City and County," specifically, Sec. 441-416, Schedule of intersection controls, be and the same is hereby amended by the addition of the following, to wit:

<u>BASE MAP</u>	<u>INTERSECTION</u>	<u>PREFERENTIAL</u>	<u>TYPE OF CONTROL</u>
34	Chesterhill Ln St. Clifford Dr	None	All-Way Stop

SECTION 3. This ordinance shall be in full force and effect upon adoption and compliance with IC 36-3-4-14.

Proposal No. 89, 2014 was retitled GENERAL ORDINANCE NO. 15, 2014, and reads as follows:

CITY-COUNTY GENERAL ORDINANCE NO. 15, 2014

A GENERAL ORDINANCE amending the "Revised Code of the Consolidated City and County," Sec. 441-416, Schedule of intersection controls.

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY-COUNTY COUNCIL OF THE  
CITY OF INDIANAPOLIS AND OF MARION COUNTY, INDIANA:

SECTION 1. The "Revised Code of the Consolidated City and County," specifically, Sec. 441-416, Schedule of intersection controls, be and the same is hereby amended by the addition of the following, to wit:

<u>BASE MAP</u>	<u>INTERSECTION</u>	<u>PREFERENTIAL</u>	<u>TYPE OF CONTROL</u>
11	Broadway St Laverock Rd	Laverock Rd	Stop

SECTION 2. This ordinance shall be in full force and effect upon adoption and compliance with IC 36-3-4-14.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

Councillor Pfisterer announced that a job fair will be held tomorrow from 10:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. at the Lakeview Church, 47 Beechway Drive, with more than 40 employers available.

Councillor McHenry thanked over 100 volunteers on the west side for coming out to help with the Great Indianapolis Clean-Up.

Councillor Sandlin announced a town hall meeting to be held on Wednesday, May 23, 2014 at 6:00 p.m. at the Peerry Township Government Center.

## **ANNOUNCEMENTS AND ADJOURNMENT**

The President said that the docketed agenda for this meeting of the Council having been completed, the Chair would entertain motions for adjournment.

Councillor McQuillen stated that he had been asked to offer the following motion for adjournment by:

- (1) Councillor Talley in memory of Leon Benjamin; and
- (2) Councillor McQuillen in memory of Dr. John L. Durrer; and
- (3) Councillor Lewis in memory of Charles Williams and Ernestine Tibbs Taylor; and
- (4) Councillors Pfisterer, McHenry and Lutz in memory of Joyce Bishop; and
- (5) Councillor Pfisterer in memory of Phillip McNulty, Michael Dorsett, Robert Biggs, and Walter Sauter.

Councillor McQuillen moved the adjournment of this meeting of the Indianapolis City-County Council in recognition of and respect for the life and contributions of Leon Benjamin, Dr. John L. Durrer, Charles Williams, Ernestine Tibbs Taylor, Joyce Bishop, Phillip McNulty, Michael Dorsett, Robert Biggs, and Walter Sauter. He respectfully asked the support of fellow Councillors. He further requested that the motion be made a part of the permanent records of this body and that a letter bearing the Council seal and the signature of the President be sent to the families advising of this action.

There being no further business, and upon motion duly made and seconded, the meeting adjourned at 10:05 p.m.

We hereby certify that the above and foregoing is a full, true and complete record of the proceedings of the regular concurrent meetings of the City-Council of Indianapolis-Marion County, Indiana, and Indianapolis Police, Fire and Solid Waste Collection Special Service District Councils on the 14th day of April, 2014.

In Witness Whereof, we have hereunto subscribed our signatures and caused the Seal of the City of Indianapolis to be affixed.

  
President

ATTEST:

  
Clerk of the Council

(SEAL)

*April 14, 2014*